

ENQUIRY
 INTO THE
 Occasional and standing Similitudes
 OF THE
 LORD GOD,
 IN THE
 OLD and NEW-TESTAMENT
 OR THE
 FORMS made Use of by JEHOVAH
 TO
 Represent themselves to TRUE BELIEVERS,
 before and since the Law by MOSES.
 WITH A
 DISSERTATION
 On the supposed
 CONFUSION of TONGUES at BABEL.

By JULIUS BATE, A.M.

You are brought unto the Fountains of living Water which ye desired not. Do not cast Earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken Pits before them with the wicked Jews. Others have laboured, and you may enter in to their Labours. The Translators to the Reader.

They neither know the Truth, nor can they patiently bear it. They are ever prepossessed with idle Jealousies, ever swayed by idle Surmises.—They quarrel with those who inform them of the Truth, and being left to themselves, they introduce and establish Heresies.

Basil to Eusebius of Samosata, complaining of Damasus and others.

LONDON:
 Printed for E. WITHERS, at the Seven-Stars, in
 Fleet-Street.

EMORY

OPTIONAL AND FANCY SIMILAR

W. O. D. O. D.

O. D. and W. T. STANLEY

TRANSFERS OF PROPERTY

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

DISPOSITION

COMMISSIONER OF LANDS



W. O. D. O. D.

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

RECORDS OF THE DISTRICT

15
P. H. G.
P. H. G.

After the Note, p. 14. Can. 18. —

And let me add here the *Abyssinian* Confession of Faith, which is drawn up in the very Terms of the Old-Testament, and evidently refers to the Cherubim.

In the Name of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, Amen, " We believe in the Name of the
" holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy
" Ghost; who are one Lord and three
" Names, one Divinity and three Faces,
" though but one *Similitude*; and are an
" equal Conjunction in Persons; *equal*, I say,
" in Divinity; one Kingdom, one Throne,
" one Word, one Spirit, &c." An Account
of the *Abyssinian* Religion by *Zaga Zaba*,
Ambassadour from the King of *Ethiopia* to
the King of *Portugal*, about the Year 1355,
from *Geddes's Hist.* p. 81.

ERRATA.

- Page 1. line 4. read where
 3. l. 23. r. are not, that
 7. l. 13. *dele* happen
 12. l. 12. r. Reference
 15. l. 5. r. Scriptures
 l. 15. r. Parables
 17. l. 6. r. Men
 31. l. 16. *dele* Comma after Angel
 41. l. 17. r. Angel
 66. l. 15. r. were round
 l. 24. r. this Text
 71. l. 16. r.; semicolon after Beast
 79. l. 6. r. v. 27
 100. l. 29. r. Censer
 107. l. 15. r. without
 133. l. 23. r. coupled
 141. l. 15. r. 29
 141. Note, r. 1 K. 7
 148. l. 31. r. Chap.
 154. l. 20. r. on o
 159. l. 11. r. Chap.
 224. l. 11. r. *Virginis, ora Diana*
 227. l. 3. r. predicated
 l. 15. *dele* Hajin
 254. l. 29. r. es,
 256. l. 5. and 19. r. 1 nun final
Memorandum, from—and in this Sense, p. 260.
 l. 30. to—The Tongue only, p.
 261. l. 10. r. in a Parenthesis
 264. and 265. r. *מא גרמ*
 276. l. 17. r. Confession
 l. 27. r. *לשן*
 309. l. 20. r. *Esau*, who was
 319. l. 15. r. have
 326. l. 7. r. *Ren*.

HOSEA xii. ver. 10.

I have spoken by the Prophets, and I have multiplied Visions, and used Similitudes [LXX. & Vulg.] of myself, by the Ministry of the Prophets.

GREAT Offence is pretended to be taken at some Parts of Mr. H—'s Writings; and at none more than when he lays open the Scripture Evidence for the Doctrine of the Trinity; and the *cabalistical* Evasions of that Evidence, and illustrates that important Mystery: By *Mystery*, I do not mean something unintelligible, and above our Capacity to comprehend, but according to the learned *Leigh's* Definition of it in his *Greek Crit. Sact. Secretum divinum symbolis, signis figurisque externis propositum ac representatum*. A divine Truth proposed under and represented by Symbols, Signs and outward Figures. In this Sense *the Trinity in Unity* is a Mystery, *the Things of God* being explained to us by those very Persons themselves, by *Notices* taken from *the Things that are made*. The Things that are made, were

B made

made on Purpose to give us Ideas, and a proper Insight into the Things of God. The emblematical Names of God, or the Things that are to give us that Degree of Knowledge and Insight into the divine Nature, which is thought sufficient for us in this State, are to be learnt from the Holy Scriptures; and in what Respects and how far they are to be thought *Resemblances* of the eternal Power and Godhead, can only be learned from the same unerring Guides, "God has revealed them to us by his Spirit, — the Things of God knoweth no one but the Spirit of God," 1 Cor. ii. 11. And says the same Apostle, Rom. i. 19. "that which may be known of God, is manifest (known) to them, (the *Gentiles*) for God shewed it to them," from the very first, "from the Creation of the World," by the Help of borrowed Ideas, "*being made intelligible* by the Things that are made." God revealed this Knowledge to Man, and all that is preserved of revealed Knowledge is recorded in the Scriptures. Thither therefore we must go, unless we would presumptuously *be wise above what is written*; or which is equally presumptuous, *be wise without*, and in Opposition to it. The Infidel and nominal Christian, who are unhappily led away with a Notion of demonstrating the Being and Attributes of God out of their own Heads, by the Light of Nature; and who frame a Picture, Form or Description of God different as it necessarily

cessarily must be, when formed out of their own Heads, from that given us by *Visions of God*, and the *Similitudes* exhibited by the *Ministry of the Prophets*; such Men are as much without God in the World, as the Heathens themselves, who set up the *Creature* (the Heavens) instead of the *Creator* for God; nay more so; because the *Creature* really exists, is invested with great Power and Glory; only wants Understanding to distinguish, and reward or punish. But these Men's Notions are to a Proverb, *entia rationis*; have no Existence but in the mere Imagination. The Infidel is to be pitied, and be treated with Tenderness, Pains should be taken to convince him of the Authenticity of Scripture; but the Christian, or Man who calls himself such, and yet will dare to hatch out of his own Head *Similitudes*, in such an important Point, is self-condemned, and acts inconsistently with his own Professions. We need not enquire whether those Professions are real or no; if they are, that is to God and himself. But he professes to believe the Scriptures, and that they are able to make him wise unto Salvation; and therefore should be treated as a false Friend, and secret Enemy. An honest Man, unless his Head be very weak, he cannot be. God, (he says) he believes has given an Account or Description of himself, and yet sets it aside for one of *his own devising*.

B

When

When we consider the Majesty of God, and what prodigious Consequence it is to us to have right Notions of the Divinity; we cannot be sufficiently alarmed at *the Offence* and *Danger* of this daring Presumption; *Offence* against the God of Heaven and Earth; and *Danger* to ourselves from the dreadful Consequence it is big with. He that disputes, or which is the same Thing, in the Eye of Law and common Sense, tacitly passes by the divine Authority; makes himself a Rebel; and while he does so, can be looked on by the King of Kings in no other Light. What may be the Sin of disputing the Authority of Scripture; or whether there be any Difference betwixt disputing that Authority and *dis-regarding* it, are Questions which nearly concern our Governors and the Governed.

Our Knowledge of God is, and (as we are limited to Sense for all our Ideas) must be *myssical*; or proposed to us by *Symbols*, *Signs* and *Figures*. What we would know of God, is his Personality, Power, Wisdom, Goodness and Justice. The Essence is invisible; is not the Object of our Understandings. We are taught by Scripture what the Substance of Matter is, *viz.* small impenetrable and indivisible Unites. But *Jehovah* the Father, the Deity itself, no Man hath seen, nor can see. But his Attributes may be illustrated by *Symbols*, *Signs* and *Figures*.

This

This *mystical* Learning is taught us in Scripture, not in a *systematic* Way; but as all the Instruction in Scripture is given, by seeming accidental Hints and scattered Definitions, which must be brought together and considered. One, if not the chief Reason of this Way of teaching us, is given, *Luke* viii. 10. When the Disciples asked our Lord, why he chose to speak to the People in Parables; he answers, *that seeing they might not see; and hearing they might not understand*; whether they would or no: But have an Opportunity of shewing their Value for the Truth, by taking Pains for it; and have a Cloak for their Perverseness, by pretending they did not understand it. Scripture is its own best Comment; and the Knowledge there is to be dug for, as well as what we get elsewhere. But what we get here is worth all the Pains we can bestow for it.

Two Points are more particularly necessary to be previously insisted upon here. *First*, That we are *limited to Sense* for all our Ideas. *Secondly*, That the Senses being the Inlet of all Knowledge, the Lesson must be conveyed to us by outward *Representations*, such as the Senses can feel or perceive. And Words being but memorial Pictures or Substitutes of what our Senses are Judges of, it follows, that the Things themselves as they exist in Nature, or artificial Images of them, must be made Use of to convey to us Ideas, or the Knowledge,

of the Things of God ; consequently, *Pictures* whether the Work of the Pencil, or Chizel, are to be looked on as *natural* Words, or Signification, without Sound, of *Ideas* ; not of Forms, or *Identity* in Action, Shape, or other Qualities ; any more than the *Letters* we spell a Word with in our present Way of Writing, are of the like Attributes of what we describe by them. God is not like the Marks or Characters that spell the Name, neither is he like a Lion, a Lamb, a Man, or any other Form, he has occasionally assumed to make himself present to his Friends. We are well enough aware of this, when we talk of the Eye, Hand, or Face of God ; Nobody, meaning by it, that he has Parts shaped like those Parts of our Bodies ; but only that he sees and acts ; has *Knowledge* and *Power* ; but how exerted is beyond our Power to conceive, any further than the Image of the Deity is stampt upon Man, who was created after the Likeness of God. And which Likeness we are all agreed consists not in the outward Shape or Form of any of our Members separately or jointly. The same we should conclude when we find the Brute Creatures pointed out to us as Pictures or Similitudes of the Deity, and should consider what *Idea* was designed to be conveyed to us ; or what its Meaning is ; as much as if it was the Meaning of Words we were enquiring into.

It

It is plain from Scripture, that it has pleased God in revealing himself to his Prophets in Visions and Dreams, to convey Ideas of his Attributes and Designs by animal Forms, and other corporeal Figures and Appearances. Consequently, there is nothing in the Nature of the Thing derogatory to the divine Honour, or apt of itself to mislead us in our Conceptions of God; some such Method of Instruction being absolutely necessary for us; and what God has condescended to make use of. Common Sense, whatever Disputation may happen, can find no Difference in Point of Propriety, whether such Appearances and animal Forms, be *standing and permanent*, or *occasional and temporary* only. Whether they be exhibited in the Air, being meerly visional; or are formed with the Pencil or Chizel; are described by the Pen or Tongue; preserved in the Memory only; or on Paper; nor any material Difference whether it be by *Letters* or *Lines*. For is not an Idol an Idol, whether *set up in the Heart*, or in the Sight? And a Similitude of God, a Similitude of him, whether conveyed into the Mind by the Eye or Ear? And whether it stand in the Sight, an Age, a Day or an Hour only? And if he has forbidden the one to be done by us, and hedged about that Prohibition, with such a Reason that even "He cannot be supposed to contravene the Reason of his Prohibition," he must have acted contrary to his own

Directions, and inconsistent with his own Honour; or they who argue so arbitrarily contradict themselves; and in the Eagerness of Opposition take that for a Reason, which *God cannot contravene*, which has no Relation to the Case, or Shadow of Truth in it.

Jehovah, the Father or Godhead, being in his own Nature invisible; and Man not being properly said to be in the Presence of those, whom he does not *sensibly*, or to his own Perception, stand before, God has condescended to assume an Appearance, and make his Presence sensible to those who were worthy, or stood in Need of his more immediate Conversation. He had been used to *appear* to *Adam*, as is plain from his being afraid to see God, and hiding himself from him after his Fall; and knowing of his Approach by the Sound of his Walking in the Garden. In what *Form* God came to him, is not said; nor what *infignia* manifested the divine Presence. God converses as if Face to Face with *Cain*, after he had refused to *have Respect unto him and his Offering*. And *Cain* was driven from the Presence of the Lord, in Punishment. Something there was then that declared that Presence. Some *outward Appearance*, or *sensible*, though it were only temporary, *Representation*. God could not be seen in *himself*; no *Man*, says he himself, *can see my Person, (me myself) and live*. And neither *Man* nor *Devil* can be driven out of his

his Sight, with whom *Darkness is no Dark-
ness at all*; and *before whom Hell is naked
and Destruction hath no Covering*. *Whither
shall I flee from thy Presence?* May every
Creature say. God then did not cease to see
Cain, but *Cain* ceased to see God; or was
driven from that which was the Presence of
God to him.

We are left entirely in the Dark, (unless
walking and *speaking* convey any Infor-
mation) as to the *Form*, or Manner of
Appearance God came to the *Antediluvians*
in. Nothing is said of any *Form* or *Insignia*,
in and by which, God appeared to the Saints
before the Flood: Nor afterwards till we
come to the History of *Abraham*, the Father
in Succession from *Shem*, of all the Sons of
Heber, or Pilgrimage, and Heir of the Pro-
mises. *The Lord came down* on the Project
of *Babel*; no Doubt to give Directions in
Person, to those who were willing to renounce
a Settlement in this World, and become
Wanderers to escape the Contagion that was
broke out in the Land of *Shinar*. *Shem*, and
from him *Abraham*, became Opposers of the
Idolatry of *Babel*, agreed to forsake their
Country, and become *Pilgrims in the Earth*.

We may safely conclude, that the Opposi-
tion to the Projectors at *Babel* arose from
Shem, because of his becoming the Father of
כל בני עבר *all the Sons of Pilgrimage*, all that
professed themselves Pilgrims on the Earth,
which

which the Builders of the Tower and City of *Babel* protested against, as well as against the God of the Heavens, by dedicating the Top of their Tower to the Creature, the *Heavens*. That an *Opposition* came from *Shem* and his Family, appears also from his second Son, *Asher's* building of *Nineveh*, which City kept a Check upon *Babel*, and *Nimrod*, (the Rebel) there; and prevented the setting up that spiritual Power and universal Sway over all the Earth, which the wicked Descendants of *Ham*, the First-Born of *Noah*, attempted to establish. An Attempt so pernicious, that God came down in Persons, " *Jehovah* said, go " to, let us go down, and there let us con- " found their Lip," or Confession. It was necessary for *Jehovah* to appear in his Persons, to defeat this wicked Scheme. His Instruments appear to have been *Shem* and his Sons, of whom, *Abraham*, in Fulness of Time, left all he had, to become the Father of the Faithful. To him God appears several Times, before he left his own Country, and afterwards, in what Form is not mentioned; till at the Promise of *Isaac*; nor with what *Insignia*, till at the Confirming of the Covenant to him, by cutting off a Purifier with him, *Gen. xv.* When a smoking Furnace and a burning Lamp, i. e. the fiery Cloud in Minia- ture, passed between the Parts of the Creatures on God's Behalf; as Substitutes of himself. No other visible Form is mentioned. Nor any

any *animal* Form, till at fixing the Time for the Birth of that Son through whom the promised Seed should be transmitted to Mankind, *Gen. chap. xviii.* where we are told, that "*Jehovah* appeared to *Abraham* amongst the Oaks of עֲרֵב עֵץ the most High, and he sat in the Tent or Tabernacle Door, in the Heat of the Day." At Mid-Day, as the Vision was to *St. Paul*, "and he lift up his Eyes and looked, and lo three Men stood by him," *sc.* by *Jehovah*, not by *Abraham*, for he was at a Distance, and "ran to meet them." Here it is plain, that these three Men were for *Jehovah* that appeared, or the visible *Personators* of what could not be seen in itself. The Glory of the Lord was the usual Symbol of his Presence; but it is not expressly said, that it appeared on this Occasion; and if it did, it was more upon the Footing of Friendship, *Abraham* being the Friend of God, to talk to him in Person than by Voice out of the Glory; and to put on the more familiar Form of Men, and converse with him Face to Face; or rather, as it is in *three Persons, Faces* to Face, and the Men to shew their Relation to what appeared as *Jehovah*, as the Manifestation of the divine Presence, stand by or close to it.—"*Jehovah* appeared, and lo three Men," *Abraham* runs to *Jehovah*, bows to the Men, offers them Refreshment as to Men, as desirous of a Communication with them by Eating and Drinking,

Drinking, as the Elders had with God at the Mount; but takes no Notice of *Jehovah* whom he saw at the same Time. It must be remarked, that *Abraham* had often seen *Jehovah*, and was well acquainted with the Emblems of the divine Presence: And as *Jehovah* appeared to him here, or was seen by him, he knew it was *Jehovah* who was come down to him; and yet he takes no Notice of any thing but the three Men. Some have supposed, and indeed our Translators themselves, by their marginal Inferences, authorise the Supposition, as far as bare Authority can go, that *Abraham* was not aware of the real Dignity of his heavenly Guests, but *unawares* entertained them as *Angels*; it may be supposed, they thought so, because he offered them Refreshment as to Men: But *Angels* need not the Refreshment of Men, and it will not follow from their Eating and Drinking with him, that they were less than the *Alcym*: Or that he thought them so, from the Compliment of Refreshment he offers, and they accept; being now in Appearance Men, and acting as such; having taken the Form of Men for that Purpose. *Abraham* could not but know them. He knew *Jehovah* was come, for the Text says, *Jehovah* was seen by him, and yet he accosts only the Men. It cannot be supposed that *Abraham* would pass by God to bow to Men; if he had seen God in any other distinct Form than

than that of *the Men*. The Inference is unavoidable, that he knew they were *Jehovah* come forth to him; or were the *Personators* of *Jehovah*, as two of them are called in the next Chapter.

And they speak accordingly as *Jehovah*; and are expressly called so several Times in this. *Abraham* hastens and prepares them a Repast, and ver. 8. " stood by them under the Trees, and they did eat. And they said unto him, where is *Sarah* thy Wife, — and * said, I will certainly return unto thee at the Time of Life; and lo *Sarah* thy Wife shall have a Son," no Creature could say this. And so it follows, ver. 13, "*Jehovah* said unto *Abraham*, wherefore did *Sarah* laugh †, — at the Time appointed I will return unto thee." So far it is apparent, that no other distinct *personal Form* is shewn, when *Jehovah* appears, than that of the three Men. That there is no Voice of *Jehovah* but from them, they are sometimes called *Jehovah*, sometimes *Men*. No Reverence is paid to *Jehovah*, but to them; no

Conversation

There is no Antecedent to *AND*, but what belongs to *AND*, viz. the Men; it must be therefore still they said (as being one *Jehovah*) I will return unto thee

† The Versions seem to have mist the Purport of God's Answer to *Sarah*, when she denied that she had laughed at the Promise of a Son, ver. 15. It should have been rendered, " Nay, but thou shalt laugh." As Chap. xxi. 6. and *Sarah* said, " God hath made me to laugh; let all that hear it, laugh with me." It was Joy to all the Earth.

Conversation but with them. They promise what no Creature has Power to perform; and that not *as from* God; but from themselves, absolutely; and in their own Name.

"I will return unto thee, is any thing too hard for *Jehovah*?" No Inference can be plainer than this; that the Men speak as *Jehovah*, and are so called; both in the *plural* and *singular* Number, as being one *Jehovah*, and three Persons.

The Testimony of our Church, near a thousand Years ago, before this Part of the Christian World was blinded by *Cabalistical Duncery*, (to borrow a modern polite Pulpit Phrase) and *Rabinical Evasion*, is worth citing; and worthy their Consideration*, who now-a-days mistake *Rabbinism* for *Hebrew*: And the *Cabala* for the Old-Testament. Such as poor Dr. *Warburton*, and the Rev. and Learned the *rural Dean* of ——— also did, when he cautioned the Clergy against *Cabalistical Duncery*, a strange Mistake this; and what may shew all the World who are the real Dunces; because it is from the *Cabalistical* Dunces, those Errors about the Appearances of *Jehovah*, both as to the occasional and standing Exhibitions of his sacred Presence, which are the *received Interpretations* of those interesting

* "He (*Abraham*) deserved not only to adore, but to entertain the Lord in Trinity." *Elegantia Canonis at Cathedralibus*, A. D. 785. *Johnson's Collection* from the *Saxon Chronicle*, Can. 13.

interesting and important Parts of Scripture, have arisen. But *Arianism*, and its bastard Brother *Socinianism* that sprung from the same Sink of Corruption, will ever look with jealous Eyes on the genuine Scriptures and *Infallibility*, the inherent Privilege of *Superiority*, will ever oppose private Judgment in construing them. The Authors of the *Cabala*, they were the Devils, that taught us all those Errors relative to the Old-Testament, which Mr. H——n has so effectually exposed.

This Mistake of some modern and modish Divines, who call every literal Construction of the Old-Testament, and all its sacred Allegories, Paradoxes and Emblems, *Cabalistical*, shews both their *Ignorance* and *Disaffection*. Their *Ignorance*, because they themselves are the *Cabalists*, (or in their polite Stile, the *Cabalistical Dunces*) if supporting the Interpretation and Comments of the Apostate Jews, brings them under that Title. And their *Disaffection*, because the Old-Testament is the original Evidence for *Christ*; of the Covenant of Grace; of the *Unity* of the eternal Essence; and *Plurality*, *Coequality*, and *Coeternity*, of the Persons; of the Sameness of the Faith, through all the Ages of the Church: The same Knowledge being set before them all; and the same Hopes actuating and enlivening their Faith; and the same Charity, (Love and Gratitude towards God, and Benevolence towards

towards Man) making them and their Services perfect; and acceptable to God, through the Mediator.

But to return. I have proposed the Testimony of our Church, that *Abraham* did here entertain *the Lord in Trinity*; as a Ballance against the common Opinion that he did not: That one only was *Jehovah*; and the other two — something they do not know what. The Text says positively, that *Jehovah* appeared, and lo three Persons stood by what was the outward Means of that Appearance. The divine Glory was what usually appeared for *Jehovah*; and Men, to Sight, the visible Personators of the sacred Persons, and in themselves invisible *in* of *Jehovah*. The Text does not say that *the Glory* attended, or was the *Chariot* of God on this condescending and familiar Visit, which was designed as an Honour to *Abraham's* Faith, and was recorded to instruct us in ours; but *Jehovah* cannot be seen in himself; something must be made use of to shew him, something was seen here distinct from the Men, and we never read of any thing else but the divine Glory made use of for that Purpose, and therefore have Reason to conclude it was so here.

The Promise of *Isaac*, and in that the Promise of *Christ*, which whoever will hear, will have Reason to laugh, this Promise being made, ver. 16. "the Men arose up from thence and looked," i. e. set their Faces and

and went, " toward Sodom, and Abraham
 " went with them to bring them on the
 " Way." As they are going, " *Jehovah*
 " said, shall I hide from *Abraham* that Thing
 " which I am going to do." Here again, is
 no other *Jehovah* present but *the Men*, and
 the Terms indiscriminately used.

As the Men were going towards Sodom, to
 see, as ver. 20. whether the Sin of Sodom was
 so great, *Jehovah* opens his Design to *Abra-*
ham, and *Abraham* draws near and interceeds
 for those wicked People. But this passes not
 before *the Men* were gone from him; as ver.
 22. would at first Sight, and as translated, in-
 incline one to think: And so that *Jehovah* and
the Men were not the same Persons.

Ver. 22. *The Men turned their Faces from*
thence, and went towards Sodom; but Abra-
ham stood yet before Jehovah.

The Hebrew doth not necessarily make
 the Disjunction; but only says, that *Abraham*
 עמד עורני *being yet standing before Jehovah*,
 approached, as he stood at an awful Distance
 before. Read the 20th, 21st, and 22d Verses
 together, as what is plainer, than that *the Men*
 and *Jehovah* are the same; and that the Note
 in the 22d Verse, was only to inform us, that
Abraham's Intercession passed before *the Men*,
 or *Jehovah* went from him. What did *the*
Men go to Sodom for, but to make the En-
 quiry, that *Jehovah* says, *he came down to*
 make himself: *Jehovah* himself went to

Sodom in some Form, because he says he came down for that Purpose.

Ver. 16, *The Men rose up from thence, and looked " towards Sodom ; and Abraham went " with them to bring them on the Way. And " Jehovah said, because the Cry of Sodom is " great, I will go down now and see."—And the Men turned their Faces from thence, and went towards Sodom; And Abraham was yet standing before Jehovah, and he drew near, that is, he drew near before Jehovah went from him; as soon as Jehovah had spoke he began his Intercession, as soon as Jehovah had done speaking, the Men went their Way towards Sodom. In which there would be no Connection or Propriety, if the Men were not Jehovah. And Abraham addresses them in the single Number, as they had before spoke of themselves in.—Wilt thou destroy.*

The 22d Verse says, *the Men* turned from thence, and went towards Sodom ; but we are told before that *Abraham* went with them. Then it follows that *Jehovah* told him, he was come down to enquire into the Sin of Sodom ; which being said, *the Men turned and went towards Sodom : But Abraham, whilst he was yet before Jehovah, drew near, and offers his Intercession, which being accepted, Jehovah went his Way, as the Men were doing before Abraham drew near in Prayer to God. So that this which has been deemed an Objection, and to prove that Jehovah was not*

not the Speaker, in, or by *the Men*, is, when examined, a plain Proof that they were the *Jehovah* who *was come down* in the Likeness of Men, and that *Jehovah* went in that Form, to enquire into the Sin of that wicked Country *in Person*, and punish it.

There is a seeming Confusion in the Language of *Abraham*.—*He seeth Jehovah, and to three Men stand by what he saw, as the Personators of Jehovah.* He addresses them, and not *Jehovah*, in the *singular Number* first,—“ My Lord, if now I have found
“ Favour in thy Sight,—pass not *thou* away
“ from *thy* Servant.”—Then in the *plural Number*, still addressing the same Appearances and under the same title of my Lord,—“ let a
“ little Water pray now, be fetched, and wash
“ your Feet, and rest ye yourselves.” Was *Abraham* in Confusion at their Sight; or in Doubt who they were? Did he not know whether there was one or three? Or could he think that God needed Refreshment? He doth not appear to be in any Confusion at all? His mind no doubt, was filled with a reverential Awe, suitable to the Majesty of those who were becoming his Guests. He runs with great Forwardness to invite them in; bows with Reverence to the Ground, and prepares the Entertainment with Haste, in the true Spirit of Hospitality: By all which, he seems well aware who they were; at least, that they were more than common Visitants; but here is no

Terror, nor Consternation. But could he not distinguish betwixt *one* and *three*, that he speaks first, as if they were but one; and in the same Breath (and under the same Appellation, with the same Veneration) as to three? If this Confusion were owing to the Hurry *Abraham* was in, what occasioned the same Confusion in the Style of the inspired Historian, ver. 9, 10, and elsewhere? He well knew who the Persons were, and calmly relates a past Transaction; ver. 9. *they said, where is Sarah thy Wife.*—*And said, I will certainly return unto thee.* Here *Moses* makes the three Men say, *I will*; not, *we will, return unto thee*; and this Irregularity of Grammar is frequent, as it is necessary and instructive, in speaking of *Jehovah*. Thus, *Gen. i. 26.* “God said, “*let us make Man in our Image.*—So God “created Man in *his own* (not in *their own*) “Image, in the Image of God created *he* “(not *they*) him.” And *2 Sam. vii. 23.* “Whom the *Aleim* *they* went to redeem to “*himself* for a People, and to make *him* a “Name; and to do for *yourselves* great “Things—before thy People, whom *thou* “redeemest. So *Gen. xi. 6.* “*Jehovah* said, “go to, *let us* go down, and there *let us* con- “found their *Lip*—So *Jehovah*, *he* scattered “them Abroad.” *Jehovah* says here, *let us* go down, and *let us* scatter, but in the Chapter before us, though he proposed to come down in three Persons, he says, “*I will go down* “now

"now and see,—and if not, *I will know.*" The Manner of the divine Existence or Plurality of Persons in the Unity of Essence, (expressed by the plural Nouns *Aleim, Holy-Ones, Judges, Creators, &c.* with the singular one *Jehovah*) admits of, and explains this grammatical Confusion. *Abraham* knew who the Persons were whom he saw when *Jehovah* appeared, and addresses himself as to *Jehovah*, not to *pass by him*. And to the Persons, that they would condescend to those Tokens of Friendship and Familiarity, which, Men in the Character of which they came, *give and receive* from each other, and *Moses* makes the Men *by whom, or in whom, Jehovah* acted, to call for *Sarah*, and then to promise the Performance as the one *Jehovah*, by whom it was to be performed. What Reason is there to think *Abraham* did not know who his Guests were, or what he said. And that *Moses* could not write the Story in proper Language? *Abraham's* offering the Men Refreshment is no Proof that he did not know who they were, any more than their accepting it is a Proof of their not being what in Reality they were. And all Authority is of our Side, that they were more than Men.

The GLORY of the LORD.

The next Question is, what was the Token or Sign, or Demonstration of the *divine Presence*?

sence ? Jehovah, as observed before, is not visible to human Eyes : Something must be shewn *for him*, or *in his stead*. The Action and Speech may be the immediate Action and Speech of God, as much as our Action and Speech, are the Action and Speech of the Man, being performed by the Organs of the Body under the Direction of the Mind. But what was seen was not *Jehovah* himself, but an assumed Appearance. It is said, that *Jehovah appeared*, and *lo three Men stood by Jehovah* ; or near that which, (whatever it was) *Jehovah* manifested himself by. There was Something that shewed *Jehovah* to be present. The Men shewed the Plurality of the Persons ; but the meer Sight of Men, though only Men in Form, did not shew *Jehovah*. There was Something that at first Sight put it out of Dispute, he *saw Jehovah and ran*. And St. Stephen, by telling us, *Acts vii. 3.* that the *God of Glory appeared to our Father Abraham*, seems to justify this fair Inference, that he appeared as the *God of Glory*, or *in Glory*. Thus St. Paul calls the *Cberubim*, *Cberubim of Glory*, because they stood in Glory. Glory was the usual, well-known, and standing Emblem of Divinity ; and what manifested the Presence of God. If that were the Case here, the Men standing by *Jehovah*, is their standing by that Glory ; and shewing themselves to be *the Persons* come forth from the *Godhead of Glory*, to entertain, and be entertained by *Abraham*.

Abraham, as Friends. There was a peculiar Splendor or Brightness upon the Face of the assumed Shapes the Divinity appeared in; "a Man of God came unto me," says *Ma-*
noah's Wife, and his Countenance was like
 "the Countenance of an Angel of God, very
 "terrible." *Jud.* 13. and *Acts* vi. 15. "St.
 "Stephen's Face was as it had been the Face
 "of an Angel." Whether the Men of God
 that came to *Abraham*, were thus terrible or
 shining in their Countenances, we can only
 guess; the Text being silent about it. The Per-
 son that appeared and foretold *Sampson's* Birth,
 shewed at first only a Glimpse of his Glory in
 his Countenance; but ascended in Fire, or in
 Glory, to Heaven; covering his whole Person
 with it at his going away; and so leaving no
 Doubt of who he was. And this Fire, Glory or
 Illumination, which exceeded the Brightness of
 the Sun at Noon-Day, (and was sometimes
 displayed at that Time of the Day, that it
 might have an Opportunity of eclipsing the
 Sun in its Strength, as to St. *Paul* at Mid-Day,
 and as we think, to *Abraham*, in the Heat of
 the Day) this Glory, as being a Demonstra-
 tion of Power and Majesty, attended the Ap-
 pearance of any one of the divine Persons.
 So *Christ* appeared to St. *Paul*, in a glorious
 Light, or a Glory of Light. So the Holy
 Ghost manifested his Presence on the Day of
Pentecost, in Tongues of Fire, i. e. of Divinity.
 And at the Baptism of our Lord, the Heaven

was opened, *sc.* as in Lightning, and the Holy-Ghost descended in a bodily Shape. And so Christ was exhibited in Glory on a Throne over the Wings of the Cherubim, and was seen in a Vision by the Prophet *Ezekiel* arrayed in this visible Divinity, chap. i. where the Appearance of the Glory of the Lord is described very particularly and minutely, and Mr. *H—n*, as the Reader may easily see by the Index under the Word *Glory*, has drawn together the Texts that speak of, or refer to this, the highest Exhibition of Power and Majesty; and the most glorious Sight, which God could give to Man; or Man desire to see, on this Side the Vision of the eternal Glory itself. When (but what Thought can as yet form a Conception of a brighter Glory than this) we shall see God, as we are seen of him. The Weight of the Glory of the Sun in its Strength, is too great for our present Strength, and we can only bear it at a Distance.

This was the outward and visible Divinity, and never attended any Person less than God, except the Man *Christ Jesus*, who is one with the Father of Lights. The Light, which is one of the three Names that constituted the emblematical Glory, dwelling says *St. Paul*, bodily in him. I except here the standing and permanent Types, Figures or Representations of *Jehovah Aleim*, and their *Christ*, the Cherubim; the Tabernacle, and Temple, had this Mark of Divinity stamped upon them;

them; or this Attestation given them from Heaven of their Relation to the God of Glory, and the Lord *Christ*. But it was holy, reserved to God, and the Things of God. *Elijah* was carried into Heaven in it, because he was now become a *glorified* Saint: But the Glory itself belongs only to God. A Portion of this Glory, or communicated Rays of this visible Divinity, attended the Messengers of God on special Occasions; as *Moses's* Face shined so bright, that the Children of *Israel* could not fix their Eyes upon him, and the whole Council saw *St. Stephen's Face*, as it had been the Face of an Angel; giving them a Specimen of that Glory he was soon to be glorified with: And a sufficient Proof that God was with him, could any Thing at that Time have opened their Eyes.

“ Is there,” says Mr. *H——n's* Essay, p. 200, “ some Operation, which, more plainly than any created intelligent Being can by Voice, declares the Glory, Wisdom and Power of him that framed it, to all Men in all Languages? you may find an Answer at large in the 19th Psalm.” *The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy Work!* “ Glory, Fire, Light and Firmament, are synonymous Terms, and only differ in Degrees?” and so are Whirlwind, Tempest, Cloud, Fire, Glory and Chariot, and differ only as they express some Part or Use, which implies all

the

the rest. The Fire burnt in the Cloud ; the Light issued from the Fire ; the Cloud was the Chariot of God where he rode in great Splendor, and displayed his Power and Glory. A Whirlwind attended the Descent of the fiery Cloud to Earth ; and the Spirit or Wind drove along this Chariot. *Psal.* 1. 3. " Our
 " God shall come—a Fire shall devour be-
 " fore him ; and it shall be very tempestuous
 " round about him," *civ.* 3. " Who maketh
 " the Clouds his Chariot, who walketh (or
 " proceedeth) upon the Wings of the Wind."
Psal. xviii. 9. " He bowed the Heavens also
 " and came down—and he rode upon a
 " Cherub, and did fly, yea he did fly upon
 " the Wings of the Wind." *Psal.* lxviii. 5.
 " Extol him that *כבב* driveth his Cha-
 " riot in the Heavens ; ver. 18. *The Drivers*
 " of the Chariot of God are Myriads." *Ijai.*
 xix. 1. " *Jehovah* rideth (or driveth his Cha-
 " riot) upon a swift Cloud." *lxvi.* 15. "*Je-*
 " *bovab* will come in Fire ; and like a Whirl-
 " wind his Chariots." As he did come, *Exod.*
 xix. 9. " I come unto thee in a thick Cloud,
 " that the People may hear and believe thee
 " for ever." Ver. 16. " Thunders and Light-
 " nings, and a thick Cloud." Ver. 18. " Mount
 " *Sinai* was altogether on a Smoak, because
 " *Jehovah* descended on it in Fire ; and the
 " whole Mountain quaked greatly." Chap.
 xx. 21. " *Moses* drew near unto the thick
 " Darkness where God was." *Deut.* iv. 11.
 " The Mountain burnt with Fire unto the
 " Midst

“ Midst of Heaven, with Darkness, Clouds,
 “ and thick Darkness; and *Jehovah* spake
 “ unto you out of the Midst of the Fire.” v. 22.
 “ *Jehovah* spake unto all your Assembly in
 “ the Mount, out of the Midst of the Fire,
 “ of the Cloud, and of the thick Darkness.”
 xxxiii. 26. “ Who rid *upon* the Heavens to thy
 “ Help: And in his Excellency on the Sky.”

Mr. *H*—*n* has sufficiently apprized every
 Reader, who has a mind to have his Ideas en-
 larged, of the Meaning of the *Glory of the*
Lord, both *Philosophically* and *Theologically*;
 and that it is *holy* to God: Not to be given to
 any thing below *the only begotten of the Father*;
 or that Man, in whom dwelleth the Fulness
 of the Godhead bodily; of which a Likeness
 of this Glory around him, was the hierogly-
 phical Evidence, described *Ezek. i. 26*. We
 have all a general Idea of what is meant by the
Glory of the Lord; and readily put that Inter-
 pretation upon it, the *Israelites* did, *Deut.*
 v. 23. “ When ye heard the Voice out of
 “ the Midst of the Darkness,—ye said, be-
 “ hold *Jehovah our Aleim* hath shewed his
 “ *Glory and his Greatness*; and we have heard
 “ his Voice out of the Midst of the Fire.”
 They had no Dispute whose Voice it was that
 came to them out of the Midst of the Fire;
 or whose Glory and Greatness this great Sight
 was a Demonstration of. Nor has Mankind
 since; Glory has always been looked upon as
visible Divinity; or hieroglyphical Mark of
 that

that Greatness, which belong peculiarly to *Jehovah* himself. See *Esfay*, p. 183, & *seq.* *Ezekiel* describes the Appearance of the fiery Cloud, chap. i. ver. 4. "and its Appearance was like that of the Heavens opening in Lightening;" *Moses* describes it, *Exod.* xxiv. 16. "The Glory of the Lord abode upon Mount *Sinai*; and the Cloud covered it.—And the Sight of the Glory of the Lord was like devouring Fire on the Top of the Mountain." And in many other Places, it is Fire burning in the Midst of a thick Cloud, open before; where *Jehovah* was in a visible Form, riding as in a Chariot.

Glory, *philosophically*, is the Powers of this System in Epitome. The solar Fire and Light issuing from it in all Directions; warming and actuating the whole Body of Heaven, or fluid Mass of aerial Matter, (as far as it was necessary the Motion should extend) surrounded with thick Darkness or stagnated Air. The *Inertia* of Matter setting Bounds to the Empire of the *Expansion*; and as in a Whirlpool, the circulating Fluid becoming a Wall to itself, and that Motion, which within a proper Distance of the Centre, shall draw any thing into its Vortex, gradually decreasing till it become a perfect Calm towards the Circumference. This Philosophy asserts a *Plenum* in Opposition to that novel Doctrine of a *Vacuum*, and the occult Qualities of *Sir Isaac Newton* and his Followers; and ascribes all to the Impulse

pulse of the aerial Fluid, which mechanically performs all the Operations of Nature. The Motion begins at the Sun; or as *Philo de Mundo*, p. 1154. expresses it, "from the Middle, and reaches to the Extremes; and presently after, turns back its Course from the Circumference, to the Place it first set out from." *The Return of the Spirit* to the solar Fire, has been thought a Difficulty, but if all be full, it must, as in a Whirlpool of Water, be a Confinement; or to use *Philo's* Metaphor, a Bond to itself; and prevent its going off to all Distances, and as some goes out other Matter must come in. Motion in a *Plenum* has been thought, at least represented as, impossible, without considering that the Fluid circulates round into the Place the moving Body leaves, as it shifts its Ground, and that immediately; as a Fish moves in Water. This *expansive* Power of the Scripture differs from the *Cartesian Vortex*, being a Motion from Center to Circumference, and *vice versa*, the Light issuing from the Sun, necessarily causing the Spirit or grosser Air to return, Quantity for Quantity. And here I do with great Pleasure, and full Confidence, refer the Reader to *the Enquiry after Philosophy and Theology*. The Sufficiency of the Scripture, and Insufficiency of the *Newtonian* Philosophy, are here demonstrated mathematically, with an Easiness of Diction, Happiness of Description, and Clearness of Reasoning, seldom

seldom to be met with. This is the philosophical Meaning of the fiery Cloud, or Fire, surrounded with Light, burning in a Cloud, which *Jehovah* came down in, to Men, in the Likeness of Men — “ A great Cloud and Fire “ catching itself, and Brightness round about “ it.” And if the Reader has a clear, precise and explicit Idea of this Matter, he will be at no Loss for the *Demonstration* and *Conviction* it gave, to all Beholders, of the divine Presence, Glory and Greatness; and we have Reason to conclude, that when *Jehovah* is said to come, to speak, to appear to any Person, as *Jehovah*, as the God of Glory, *i. e.* so as to be known to be such, that this Glory, first or last, shewed itself for Proof and Conviction. It is not always expressly mentioned; but we find it always exhibited on the Vision of God, when there was, or would have been any reasonable Doubt.

A N G E L.

There is another Word used for *visible God*, and that is *Angel*. Which Word in our common Discourse being understood of the created intelligent Spirits, leads too many People, nay some of the very learned themselves, into a Notion that those Appearances called the *Angel of the Lord*, were of Creatures, whom they suppose to be God's Ministers or Agents over us. As if *Jehovah*, the King of Glory could not

not act but by delegated Commands, and needed like an earthly Prince, such Servants to execute his Will. And this, as the Traditions of the Elders always are, is maintained against the plainest, most frequent, and most express Assertions of the Scriptures.

The Word מלאך *Angel* does not determine the Nature or Essence of what it is used for ; nor is it so much as pretended that it does : But “ is indifferent and common, denoting any Messenger or Legate,” neither does the Greek αγγελος, whence our English Word *Angel*, but is, says the learned Leigh, from St. *Austin*, *Nomen non naturæ, sed officii*. What then are we precisely to understand by it, when applied to *Jehovah* ; and the *Angel*, *Jehovah*, or of *Jehovah*, is said to appear, as *Exod. iii. 2*, “ The Angel of *Jehovah* appeared to *Moses* in a Flame of Fire, (i. e. in Glory) out of the Midst of a Bush. And—God called to him out of the Midst of the Bush, and said, I am the God of thy Fathers—and *Moses* hid his Face, and was afraid to look on God.” That this was an Appearance of *Jehovah*, as far as that could, or it was proper to be made visible to *Moses*, is determined by the express Words of the Text. God was here visible, because *Moses* hid his Face, as in Reverence and Humility ; being afraid to look on God ; which he knew he might have done. What then are we precisely to understand by the Word *Angel*, which

which is added to *Jehovah*, and said to appear, when at other Times it is *Jehovah*, the Word of *Jehovah*, or &c. which appears. A literal Construction of the Word will answer the Question. As a Noun with a Mem prefixed, it is an *Instrument or Mean of Action*. Now *Jehovah* being in his own Nature invisible to Eyes of Flesh and Blood, must assume some Form, or Shape, that *he may be seen to be present* to those he condescends to converse with. That visible Form, or assumed Appearance, was an *Angel, Agent or Mean of Visibility, Action and Speech*, from God to Men. When *Jehovah* appeared as *Friends* to *Abraham*, and eat and drank with him, the Form or Mean of Visibility was *human*, in three Persons. The *Angel of Jehovah* is distinguished from the *Glory*, as in the Text last cited, *the Angel of Jehovah appeared in a Flame of Fire*. And the *Angel of Jehovah* that appeared to *Gideon*, and that to *Manoah* and his Wife, are distinguished from the divine *Glory*, or the *Fire*, which at the first Sight of it determined them to call the Angel that appeared, *Jehovah and God*. *Jud. xiii. 19.*
 “ *Manoah took a Kid with a Meat Offering,*
 “ *and offered it on a Rock to Jehovah; and*
 “ *he did wondrously; for it came to pass,*
 “ *when the Flame went up towards Heaven*
 “ *from off the Altar, that the Angel of Jeho-*
 “ *vah ascended in the Flame of the Altar,*
 “ *and Manoah and his Wife looked on; and*
 “ *fell*

“fell on their Faces to the Ground—and
 “Manoah said, we shall surely die, because
 “we have seen God.” The Angel com-
 manding the Fire, and making it his Chariot
 to Heaven, left no Dispute with them, who
 it was they had seen; and these Places seem
 to point out the Reason of adding the Word
Angel to *Jehovah*: And saying, the Angel of
Jehovah appeared; and not simply, as in the
 Vision to *Abraham*, that *Jehovah* appeared.
 Something must be shewn for *Jehovah*, or
 some Appearance assumed when he was seen;
 and, therefore, it is the *Angel* was seen: And
 not the very *Jehovah*. For, “No Man
 “shall see me,” says he himself, “and
 “live.” *St. John*, *Rev.* chap. i. confer, ver.
 1 and 13. explains *Angel* in this Sense.—The
 “Revelation of *Jesus Christ*—and he sent
 “and signified it by *his Angel* unto his Ser-
 “vant *John*.—I turned to see the Voice that
 “spake with me; and, being turned, I saw
 “—one like unto the Son of Man,” who
 speaks and acts as the *real Person* he repre-
 sented. The *Angel*, and the *Opus*, one like,
 (an assumed Appearance) are the same Thing.
 “Every Appearance,” says Mr. H——n,
 “or Type, singular or plural, as, Fire,
 “Light, Spirit, the Cloud, the Figure or
 “Figures, or that from which the Action or
 “Voice came, was not the *real Essence*, nor
 “a Person of the *real Essence*, but the *Mean*,
 “the Agent. These Representations were,

" as they are properly called, the *Actors*, the
 " *Personators*, which is the real Construction,
 " in these Cases, of מְלֹאכִים or &c. But
 " that Species of Presence, which was in it
 " or in them, was the Presence of *Jehovah*,
 " of the *Aleim*, or a Person of *Jehovah*
 " *Aleim*; and the Action, the Action of
 " *Jehovah*, or one of the *Aleim*, and not of
 " any created Being or Intelligence. This,
 " or other Words, with *Jehovah*, are not
 " used to express or distinguish a created in-
 " telligent Being from *Jehovah*, but to dis-
 " tinguish the Appearance, or Type or Fi-
 " gure, from which the Action or Voice
 " proceeded, from the immediate Essence, or
 " from a Person of the immediate Essence,
 " which is *jointly*, or *each*, the Father of
 " Men, which no Man had ever seen, till
 " that Essence was really present or visible in
 " *Christ*." *Heb. Writ.* p. 453. Our Saviour
 signifies the Revelation by his Angel; but the
 Voice came from one like unto himself, " *one*
 " *like unto the Son of Man*;" not the real
 Person, the very son of Man, and yet he
 speaks as such, i. 17. " Fear not; I am the
 " first and the last. I am he that liveth, and
 " was dead; and behold I am alive for ever-
 " more." And again, chap. ult. ver. 16.
 " I, *Jesus*, have sent *mine Angel* to testify
 " unto you these Things. I am the Root
 " and Offspring of *David*."

The

The next Question is, what was the Form or Shape assumed on these Occasions, that the *Angel* of the Lord, or of God, is said to be seen? I think, we have sufficient Authority to say, it was *human*; whether of *one* or *more* Men. We have no Hint that it was ever otherwise; but *positive Assertions*, and the *plainest Inferences*, that it was often so. I shall run through the Visions, and consider some Expressions where this Word occurs, with a View to the *Shape* of the Angel, and the Dignity of his Person. To *Abraham*, we have seen, the Vision was in three Persons in human Shapes. The Angel, *Gen.* xvi. talks with *Hagar* as one Person to another with us; and she calls him *Jehovah* and God, ver. 13; but no Form is mentioned: But, as no Creature has an articulate Speech but Man, we may fairly conclude from thence, that this was human.

The next Vision under the Term Angel, is chap. xix. to *Lot*; where *two* came to him in human Appearance, ver. 1. "There came two Angels to *Sodom* at Even; and *Lot* sat in the Gate." He addresses them in the plural Number, "Behold now, my Lords, turn ye in, pray now, into your Servants House, and tarry ye all Night—and they turned in unto him—and they did eat." The People of the City took them for Men, and so did *Lot*: "Where are the Men that came in to thee this Night ;

“Night—unto these Men do nothing.” There was Reason for concealing themselves; and *Lot* speaks to them as to Men, in the plural Number. But after they had declared themselves, by the Miracle of Blindness on that wicked People; and in express Words, “We will destroy this Place—*Jehovah* has sent us to destroy it,” he addresses them *as to one*; and they speak in the *singular Number* also, and in the Language of God. “The Angels hastened *Lot*—and while he lingered, the Men laid hold upon his Hand—and when they had brought them forth, *said*, escape for thy Life—*Lot* said unto them, Oh, not so, my Lord; behold now, *thy* Servant hath found Grace in *thy* Sight, and *thou* hast magnified *thy* Mercy.” They answer, “See, *I have* accepted thee concerning this Thing also; that *I* will not overthrow this City. Haste thee, escape thither; for I cannot do any Thing till thou be come thither.” *Lot* speaks to them, says the Text, in the singular Number; and they answer also as one. *I have accepted thee, I will not overthrow this City. I can do nothing till thou be come thither.* He doth not speak to one of them, ver. 18. *Lot said unto them, Oh, not so, my Lord;* but he speaks to them as one *Jehovah*, directing his Speech to the two Angels, to them.

The

The second Vision to *Hagar*, chap. xxi. 17.
 " The Angel of God called to *Hagar* out of
 " Heaven," but no Form is mentioned ; any
 more than there is in the next Chapter, where
 " the Angel of the Lord called to *Abraham*
 " out of Heaven, and said, lay not thine
 " Hand upon the Lad : For now, I know,
 " that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast
 " not with-held thy Son, thine only Son from
 " me." The *Angel* says *Abraham* had not
 with-held his Son from him. The Inference
 is obvious, that the Angel was God, or of God.

The next Vision is to *Jacob*, chap. xxviii.
 The Angels of God ascend and descend by
 a Ladder, that reaches from Heaven to Earth.
 No Form is mentioned, only there must be
 some distinct Shape, because he saw them go
 up and down ; and *Jehovah* stood *יָלַד* by
 them ; they being the *Personators* of *Jehovah*,
 as in the Vision to *Abraham*, who can only be
 seen by the *Glory* ; and conversed with by the
 Angel or Angels.

The Vision to *Moses*, *Exod.* iii. says nothing
 of the Shape, but some visible and perceptible
 one it was, because he saw the Angel.

The Appearance to *Balaam*, *Numb.* xxii.
 was in a human Form, because the Person
 had a Sword in his Hand.

The Appearance to *Joshua*, chap. v. 13,
 was of a Man with a Sword drawn in his
 Hand, who calls himself, *Captain of the Host*

of the Lord; and the Text, in the Beginning of the next Chapter, *Jehovah*.

The Form of the Angel of *Jehovah*, who speaks in the Language of God, to all the Children of *Israel*, *Jud. ii.* is not mentioned; but he says, "I made you go up out of *Egypt*, and have brought you into the Land, which I swore unto your Fathers?" Which sufficiently determines who he was: No Prophet or meer Creature speak in this Language, but as chap. vi. 8. "The Lord sent a Prophet unto the Children of *Israel*, which said unto them, thus saith the Lord God of *Israel*, I brought you up from *Egypt*."

The Angel which came to *Gideon* (in this last cited Chapter) and sat, under an Oak in *Ophrah*, and whom *Gideon* did not at first know, must be in a human Form; for had any other Appearance spoke to him, or had he only heard a Voice, that must have alarmed him, which he doth not seem to be, till ver. 14.

"*Jehovah* looked upon him, and said, go in this thy Might, have not I sent thee?—

"And *Jehovah* said, surely I will be with thee" *Gideon* offers him a Meat-Offering

and a Kid; and the Angel touched them with the End of his Staff; and there rose a Fire out of the Rock. Which put an End to *Gideon's* Doubt, if he had any before, about who he was: And put him in Fear of his Life as one who had seen God.

But

But what seems to determine the usual Appearance of the Angel being *human*, with another Circumstance, is what *Manoah's* Wife says to him, chap. xiii. 6. "A Man of God came to me, and his Countenance was like the Countenance of the Angel of God very terrible," i. e. sparkling and glittering; the divine Effulgence overspreading his Face. For so *terrible* is explained, *Ezek.* i. 22. *Like the Eye of Frost, terrible, glittering and dazzling.* Any Thing smooth and polished, of an uneven Surface, and Frost especially, will reflect the Light, and sparkle and dazzle the Sight. *Dan.* x. 6. "His Face as the Appearance of Lightning, and his Eyes as Lamps of Fire." *Rev.* i. 14. "His Eyes as a Flame of Fire." This is spoke of the *Angel* of *Jesus*; describing the Form he assumed to be visible to these favourite Servants. But on more ordinary Occasions the Glory was milder, the Countenance less sparkling; and giving a not too alarming, and too quick an Intimation of the Dignity of the divine Visitant. So the *Angel* that appeared to *Cornelius*, *Acts* x. was a Man in bright Cloathing. The Tradition of this divine Light on the Face of the *Personators* or Angels of God, runs through the Heathen World, who always made it one Mark of the Divinity in that *Likeness* of Men, the Gods came down in. From this Text we may fairly infer, that the *Angel* of God was always Man in Appearance; but his Countenance

shining with a more than human Lustre, *Manoah's* Wife could not but know what the Appearance of the *Angel of God* was; and she speaks without any Doubt, *that it was of a Man with Rays of divine Glory in his Countenance.* "A Man of God," says she, "came to me." A Man who spoke to me in the Name of God. I had a Suspicion he was more than Man, his Countenance being so very bright and sparkling, like the Countenance of the Angel of God, but "I asked him not whence he was, nor told me his Name." I asked him not, nor did he tell me who he was. These pious humble Souls would have been overwhelmed, had the Majesty of God opened upon them at once. Had the divine Glory shone forth, as it did upon *St. Paul* and some other Prophets, in a sudden and full Blaze, they would not have been able to have sustained themselves under the Terror, Surprise and Hurry it would have thrown them into. *St. John* became as dead at the Sight of it; and *Daniel* says, "I saw the great Vision and there remained no Strength in me." The Glory of this Light struck *St. Paul* blind; and something of this Kind, it is not improbable, struck with Blindness the Men of *Sodom*, the Angels looking, not in Light, but in Fire, upon them. The Glory was commonly veiled, and the Opening more gradual, at the happy personal Intercourses betwixt God and Man. The Surprise of seeing for

for certain, on the Angel's ascending in a Flame of Fire, (the Likeness of the Glory of God) that it was the God of Glory, who had been present with them, was so great, that *Manoah* expected no less than immediate Death. *Manoah* said, *we shall surely die, because we have seen God.*

This Angel is all along spoke of, and when introduced speaking, speaks as in the Character and Person of God. *Jacob* says, *Gen. xlviii. 16.* "The Angel which redeemed me from all Evil; bless the Lads." *Exod. xxiii. 20.* "Behold I send the Angel before thee; beware of him, and obey his Voice, and do all that I speak, then will I be an Enemy unto thine Enemies—for mine Angels shall go before thee." *xxxiii. 14.* "My Presence (יהוה) shall go with thee, and I will give thee Rest." *Ver. 15.* "If thy Presence go not, carry us not hence—is it not in that thou goest with us?" Whose Voice was it that came to *Moses*? What Presence was there with them? And what was it that did go before them? The fiery Cloud and *Jehovah* in it, was what went before them. Nothing else is mentioned. The Voice that they were to obey, and which Voice is called the *Angel's Voice*, and *God's Speaking*, was the Voice of *Jehovah*; and no other Voice came out of the Cloud to them, but *Jehovah's*. *Ver. 9.* of this last Chapter cited, "The Cloudy Pillar descended, and stood at the Door

“ Door of the Tabernacle—and the *Lord*
 “ talked with *Moses*.” The People all knew
 that it was *Jehovah* who was in the fiery
 Cloud, or cloudy Pillar, for at the Sight of it,
 “ they rose up and worshiped, and *Jehovah*
 “ spake unto *Moses* Face to Face, as a Man
 “ speaketh unto his Friend.” It must be the
Angel's Face *Moses* saw, for the *real Face* of
 God he could not see. It was the *visible*
Form *Moses* talked with, and he conversed
 as some had done before, and others since, with
Jehovah in Person, appearing as a Man in Glory,
Face to Face, Mouth to Mouth. “ *Moses*,”
 says St. *Stephen*, *Act. vii. 37.* “ was in the
 “ Church in the Wilderness with the *Angel*,
 “ which spake to him in the Mount *Sinai*.”
 Ver. 153. “ Received the Law by the Dispo-
 “ sition of Angels.” By which it seems, that
Moses at some Times saw like *Abraham* and
 others, more Appearances, than one; but no
 Angel spoke to *Moses* at *Sinai*, but *Jehovah*
 in Glory; the Angel in whom the Name of
 God was. The seventy Elders, chap. xxiv. 10,
 Saw God in human Appearance, and under
 his Feet was the Similitude of the Glory, “ as
 “ it were the Body of Heaven in Clearness.
 “ They saw God and did eat and drink.”
 The Angel that went before them, we see, was
Jehovah in human Appearance in the fiery
 Cloud. And *Jehovah* was seen, though not
 by all the People; yet by chosen and proper
 Witnesses.

These Texts sometimes speak of the Angel's going with them, sometimes of *Jehovah's*, sometimes of the Presence of *Jehovah*, going with them; and all to the same Purpose. *Isaiab*, chap. lxiii. 9. joins the several Phrases together, "In all their Affliction *לֹא צָרָה* they "were not *oppressed* or distressed, for the "Angel of his Presence saved them." The *Angel* then and the *Presence* are not different Things; the *Angel* being the *Agency*; and the *Presence* the *Presence* of *Jehovah* himself; for it is plain from the whole History of the *Jews*, that it was *Jehovah* in Person who delivered them, and by his own Voice gave them the Law, and all the Statutes and Judgments of it. And not one single Place is there where any other *Angel* than *Jehovah* in human Shape in Glory, that had any Intercourse with them. The *Angel of his Presence* is the same as the Angel or *Angels*, which always behold the Face of God, ready to go forth and assist the little ones; to be sent forth to minister for them who shall be Heirs of Salvation. They are the *Angels of God*, as being his Personators, and the *Angels of the little ones*, as they act for them and in their Behalf. These Angels are sent, are spoke to by *Jehovah*; stand by him, and see his Face, being only in St. *John's* Phrase *ὁμοιωσι*, so not real *Jehovah*; but as such, speak and act as in his Place. This was the Angel *Jacob* wrestled with all Night; emblematically contending with Providence; and

and bearing up against the Struggles, the Trials, the Persecutions, he was to meet as Father, and Representative of the Church Militant, now going down into *Egypt*. And by it he was forewarned of what was to come, and assured of a Blessing upon his Endeavours. The Angel said, "thy Name shall be called no more *Jacob*, but *Israel*, (the Prince of God) for as a Prince hast thou Power with God and with Men; and shalt prevail— and *Jacob* called the Name of the Place *Peniel*, (the Face of God) for I have seen God Face to Face." These are the guardian Angels, and the Angels that are in the Midst of the Congregation of God, when assembled for divine Service; or at their private Devotions, as *Eccles. v. 6*. "When thou vowest a Vow unto God, defer not to pay it—suffer not thy Mouth to cause thy Flesh to Sin, neither say thou before the Angel that it was an Error." What Angel is here meant but God, whose Presence he that prays, is for that Time, more immediately in. And thus *St. Paul* orders, that the Woman should wear a Covering on her Head at Church, in Token of Coverture or Subjection, "in Sign that she is under the Power of her Husband," says the marginal Note, *1 Cor. xi. 10. because of the Angels*: In modern Language, *because God is present there*: And therefore the Women should behave there, as the Church would do,

do, in the very Presence of God; and in Subjection to *Christ* their Head. We read of God and *Christ* being in the Midst of our religious Assemblies; and have sufficient Proof that they are our *Agents* or *Angels*. We are not taught to pray to Creatures: Nor does God need or make use of their Ears to hear the Petitions of those who call upon him; or of their Assistance to answer them. But the Appearance was assumed in Condescension to human Capacity; that they whom God conversed with might see he was present to them; and the several Accounts of God's appearing were recorded for the Sake of others, who are under the divine Protection, and were to be assured of it, though they see it not with their bodily Eyes. But it is the Providence of God, not of his Creatures, that watches over them; and the same Language is used to assure us of it; as was used to those who saw it in *Vision*; *Psal.* xxxiv. 8. "The Angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him." *Pf.* cxxi. "Jehovah is thy Keeper: Jehovah is thy Shade upon thy right Hand—Jehovah shall keep thee from all Evil. He shall keep thy Soul." cxxiv. 8. "Our Help is in the Name of Jehovah who made Heaven and Earth. The Mountains are round about Jerusalem; so is Jehovah round about his People, from henceforth even for ever." God gave *Elisba's* Servant at his Request ocular Proof of it, "the Lord opened the Eyes

" Eyes of the young Man, and he saw :
 " And behold, the Mountain was full of
 " Horses and Chariots of Fire (the visible
 " Representation of the divine Glory) round
 " about *Elisba*."

And hence the Propriety and Beauty of
 that high Address so frequent to Kings and
 Prophets — " Good in my Sight as an Angel
 " of God." " As an Angel of God so is my
 " Lord." " Wise according to the Wisdom
 " of an Angel of God." And the like.
 Which was speaking of them as God's more
 immediate Representatives on Earth ; as In-
 struments, by whom God exemplified his di-
 vine Attributes.

When St. *Peter* was in Prison, *Acts* xii,
 doubly chained and trebly guarded, " behold,
 " the *Angel of the Lord* came upon him,
 " and a *Light* shined in the Prison ; and he
 " smote *Peter* on the Side," and struck off his
 Chains, and brought him out of Prison ;
 on which, *Peter* coming to the House of
Mary, the Mother of *John*, where many
 were gathered together to pray ; and knock-
 ing at the Gate, a *Damsel* came to enquire,
 and knowing his Voice, for Joy ran in to
 tell, that *Peter* stood at the Gate ; which, as
 they thought him too fast in Prison, they
 would not believe : But, on her constantly
 affirming it, they said, *It is his Angel*. The
 Angel attended by the divine Light bespeaks
 himself ; but what did they mean by *Peter's*
Angel ?

Angel? That they were mistaken in thinking it his Angel, is certain, it being he himself. But we cannot suppose they did not know what they meant. *Leigh* and an Author cited by him in his *Greek Crit. Sacr.* under the Word *Angel*, were puzzled with this Text, under the common Interpretation, and say, "*Nibil est absurdi, si statuamus nuncium eo loco Angelum dici. Quod si dicemus hunc fuisse peculiarem Angelum Petri custodem, necesse est etiam ut dicemus, Angelos Custodes, vocem, figuram gestum, et reliqua eorum, quorum sunt Custodes assumere, quae quorsum pertineant, non facile est despicere.*" This Reasoning holds more strongly against its being a common Messenger, as their Notion of its being a common Messenger does against the Text, which says it was *Peter* himself. How could, or if he could, why should a common Messenger assume the Voice, Gesture and Appearance of *St. Peter*, or of any other Person that should send him on an Errand? And I believe it is pretty plain, they thought it was such an Angel of this good Man, (looking upon him as slain, that Night, though it was not intended till next Day) as God in Condescension to human Capacity, and in Compliment to his Friends, was pleased to assume, and send of himself; neither a common Messenger, nor guardian Angel, but *ὁμοιος αὐτῷ, one like unto him*: In whom *St. Peter's* Spirit they supposed was present.

Angel

Angel is a Word that occurs often, and applied to different Subjects, as all general Words are, without losing the Idea belonging to them. There are created intelligent Angels mentioned; of which, some sinned, not having kept their first State, or stood upright in their State of Probation, whatever, whenever, and where-ever that Trial was. They are reserved in Chains of Darkness to the Judgment of the great Day; they are permitted to tempt Men, going about like a roaring Lion seeking whom to devour; and they are to be the Tormentors of those whom they can make their Prey; and they had Power given them over the very Bodies of Men in our Lord's Time, that the World might have a demonstrative Proof of their Existence, and of their Malice to us, in that dreadful Specimen they then gave of their Pleasure in tyrannizing over the Bodies of those they were allowed to take Possession of; and that they can do so; which some People affect not to believe; and also that we might know where to apply for Assistance against them, by the Power *Christ* exercised over them; which Power, and the Necessity of which Assistance, so many are now allowed publicly to disown and dispute. But as so much depends upon our *standing against the Wiles of the Devil*, we are very frequently warned of the Danger we are in from them; and in what Armour we shall be able to overcome these

these Enemies of Righteousness: The Shield of Faith being Proof against their fiery Darts.

The good Angels, who kept their first State, are not so often mentioned in Scripture; and are once found within the Verge of this material System, namely, when they joined the Angel of the Lord, and in the Praises of God, at the Birth of the Prince of Peace. Luke ii. 13. "Suddenly there was with the Angel, a Multitude of the heavenly Host "praising God?" And they are called *Angels* in the next Verse but one. They were the created intelligent Spirits; but the Angel of the Lord was *Jehovah*, as appears by the *Glory of the Lord*, which, from him, shone round about the Shepherds. There are Places, which are supposed to speak of these created intelligent Spirits, in the Old and New Testament both, where the Context does not perhaps absolutely determine which are spoke of; those which are called the Angel and Angels of God, as his *Personators*; those which are called *his*, as he created them; whether the *material* heavenly ones, or the *immaterial* heavenly Host; or Men, because employed by him in his Affairs with Men: And we must judge, by comparing the Expressions with those Passages where the Point is determined. The chief Difficulty is, I hope, got over, and the main Point determined, *viz.* that *Jehovah* appearing in Glory

is called *an Angel*; and that he, as such, is the Guardian of Men, and not the created intelligent Spirits: The Glory or Light that attended these Appearances, in a greater or less Degree, being the Glory of God, and Manifestation of his Presence.

The *Angel of God*, which came to *Cornelius*, Acts x. called, ver. 122. *an holy Angel*, and ver. 30. *a Man in bright Cloathing*, we may conclude from the above Account, was no Creature; nor those *Angels*, which, Mat. iv. 11. came and ministered to our Lord after his Temptation; nor those which are called the *Reapers*, chap. xlii. 39. and which, ver. 49. are to come forth, and *sever the Wicked from amongst the Just*; and which, chap. xxv. 31. are to attend *Christ* at the last Judgment: When he is to come in the *Glory of his Father with the holy Angels*, Mark viii. 38. "to be revealed from Heaven with the *Angels of his Power*, in flaming Fire," 2 *Thes. i. 7.* These *holy Angels*, being the *Power of God* rendered visible to the Eyes of Creatures, who could not otherwise see it exert itself; as all Creatures will at the Day of Judgment. And, as a numerous Army is a powerful one, and the more numerous, the more powerful; these Angels are spoke of, as being of an infinite Number. "Thinkest thou," says our Lord to *Peter*, "that I cannot now pray to my Father; and he shall presently give me more than twelve
"Legions

"Legions of Angels?" *Matt.* xxvi. 53."

And they filled the Mountain round about *Elisba*, in the Form of Fire, as before cited.

The Power of God does not consist in Angels, in our common Sense of the Word; nor are they the Instruments he acts by towards Men, as we have seen, by so many Instances in the Old-Testament; he himself being the Agent, and the *Heavens* his Instruments to act with; and the *Heavens* are the *mechanical* Agents or Angels, on which our Life and Health depend, our Being and well-being here; and these are *Powers* adapted to our Senses, and such as they can judge of; and when we know their Mechanism and ordinary Course of acting, we can see where they were made to act out of Course, being over-ruled by him that created and formed them. That the three material Names or Powers of the Air are called *Angels*, from their being the *Agents* created and formed by God to rule in this System, see Mr. *H—* vol. D. p. 107. They are spoke of *Psal.* ciii. 20, 22. "Bless the Lord, ye his Angels, that excel in Strength, that do his Commandments; obeying the Voice of his Word. Bless ye the Lord, all his Host; ye Ministers of his that do his Pleasure. Bless ye the Lord, all his *Works* in all Places of his Dominion." *civ.* 4. "Who maketh his Angels Spirits; and his Ministers *the flaming Fire.*" *cxlviii.* 2, 3, 4.

" Praise ye him, all his Angels; praise ye
 " him, all his Hosts. Praise ye him, Sun
 " and Moon; (*i. e.* solar and lunar Lights)
 " praise him, all ye Stars of Light. Praise
 " him, ye Heavens of Heavens." *Job iv.*
 18. " Behold" אֱלֹהִים לֹא יִתֵּן *he hath not given*
 " *Strength or Stability to his Servants; or*
 " *given the Glory to his Angels;*" *sc.* as their
 own, or independant of him; and it is as no-
 thing with respect to his. The Comparison
 here is—If the Glory of the Heavens is not
 their own, and they have no Strength or
 Durableness in them with Respect to God,
 how should Man be צַדִּיק more just or up-
 right in his Doings than God; or be able to
 make himself *equal Weight* with God: As he
 says, chap. xxv. " Behold even to the Moon,
 " and אֲרָזִים לֹא יִתֵּן *he has given it no fixed Sta-*
 " *tion or Tent;* and the Stars are not pure in his
 " Sight; how should Men?" It is true, the
 created intelligent Spirits are called Angels,
 and by other Names common to the Powers
 of the Air; but they are not the *flaming Fire*,
 nor the Lights or Host of the Heaven or Air;
 nor are they the Chariots or Charioteers of
 God: But the *Winds* or Spirits, and Fire and
 Light; they were his Chariots, the Demon-
 stration of his Presence, and Manifestation of
 his Power, as well in rewarding as punishing.
Psal. xcvi. 23, " Clouds and Darkness are
 " round about him—a Fire goeth before
 " him, and burneth up his Enemies round
 " about.

"about. His Lightenings enlightened the
 "World—the Hills melted like Wax at the
 "Presence of the Lord—the Heavens de-
 "clare his Righteousness——thou *Jehovah*
 "art above all the Earth: Thou art exalted
 "above *all Gods*." This Host of Heaven,
Neb. ix. 6. is said to worship God, "Thou
 "hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Hea-
 "vens, *with all their Host*; the Earth, and
 "all Things therein: The Seas, and all that
 "is therein; and thou preservest them all,
 "and *the Host of Heaven worshipeth thee*."
 St. Paul hath a Citation, *Heb. i. 6.* "Let all
 "the Angels of God worship him," which
 is supposed to be a Citation from the 97th
 Psalm, though not verbatim; the Words be-
 ing there, "*Worship him all ye Gods*." The
 Host of Heaven were the Gods of the Hea-
 thens, and are still the *Angels of God*. They
 were set up as Rivals against God: and their
 Subjection is predicted in numberless Places.
 As ver. 5. "The Hills, (the Places where
 "the Images of their Gods stood) melted like
 "Wax at the Presence of the Lord." *Psal.*
viii. 1. "who hath set thy Glory above the
 "Heavens." And *cviii. 5.* "Be thou exalted
 "O God above the Heavens." *The Gods*,
 who are commanded in *Psal. xcvi.* to wor-
 ship *Jehovah*, the King of Glory, the Lord of
 the whole Earth, it is evident are the Gods of
 the Heathens——"Confounded be all they
 "that serve graven Images, that boast them-

" felve o' Idols : Worship him *all ye Gods*." It is plain by the Context what *Gods* are spoke of, and so in the preceding Psalm, " the Lord " is great and greatly to be praised : He is to " be feared above all Gods : For all the Gods " of the Nations are *Idols* : But the Lord " made the Heavens : " It is the Gods of the Heathens, which were something besides their Images, (as the Word *Image* implies) that are spoke of in these two Psalms ; and those Gods are the *Angels of our God* : And the *King of Glory*, they are commanded to worship, is the *Lord of all the Earth* ; him, to whom on his Ascension, *all Power in Heaven and Earth was given*. So that the *Epistle to the Hebrews* agrees in Sense, exactly and precisely, though not in Words with the *Psalm*, in the Citation and Application of the Prophecy. And thereby shews the Dignity of the Son, who was made to be Lord of Heaven and Earth, by Virtue of his Union with the *eternal Light*. And the Difficulty thought to be in this Citation from the *Psalms*, arose from not observing that the *Gods*, the *Psalmist* spoke of, were, and still are *Angels* or Agents ; and though devoid of Understanding, great and glorious Instruments in the Hand of God. The *Epistle* goes on, " But of his *Angels* " he says, who maketh his *Angels Spirits* ; " and his Ministers a Flame of Fire." Ver. 7. which is a Citation from *Psal. civ. 4.* the *Angels* spoke of in this Verse, are the same the

the Apostle was speaking of in the preceding, and if we look into the *Psalm*, we shall find that it is still the same material Agents who are spoken of, "Who coverest thyself with Light, as with a Garment: Who stretchest out the *Heavens* like a Curtain: Who layeth the Beams of his Chambers in the Waters: Who maketh the Clouds his Chariot: Who walketh upon the Wings of the Wind. Who maketh his Angels, Spirits; his Ministers a flaming Fire. Who laid the Foundations of the Earth." This Intermixture or Connection of these *Angels* with the Formation of the *Heavens* and *Earth*, shews what *Angels* and *Ministers* are spoken of, viz. those which constitute the Expansion and Firmament of Heaven, and by which the Earth was formed. So that the *Apostle* and *Psalmist* speak of the same Creatures, the Powers of the Air, and their highest Honour is to be *Agents* and *Ministers*, or Servants obeying the Will of God. The Translation gives the Words in the Order they stand in the Original; and seems to make the *Psalmist* say, that God maketh the *Angels* to be *Spirits*, Winds, or Blasts of Air and Fire. It can be no Glory to the intelligent *Angels*, who are of a Nature more excellent than the Air, to be made *aerial*; for so I apprehend we must understand רוחות, being in Conjunction with שׂר Fire: Nor does it appear why they should be so degraded; and their very Substance

E 4 changed

changed and lowered. Take the Words, as the Hebrew will certainly bear; that the Winds, Blasts of Air, Clouds and Fire, are the Angels, Agents, Servants and Ministers of God; this is literally true, and intelligible to them who consider, what the Heavens and their Hosts are, and what they do for us: And how constantly and uniformly they obey the Will of God. And it appears from the Context in the Psalm, that it is the *ethereal*, not *immaterial* Angels, the Citation speaks of in the Original. These were Attendant upon God at the Delivery of the Law from Mount Sinai, and on other Occasions. *Psal. xviii. 13.* "The Lord also thundered in the Heavens; and the Highest gave his Voice; Hail-Stones and Coals of Fire. Yea, he sent out his Arrows and scattered them; and he shot out Lightenings and discomfited them." And *Psal. l. 3.* "Our God shall come, a Fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." *Hab. iii. 3.* "Before him went the Pestilence, and burning Coals went forth at his Feet." Such pestilential Burning and destroying Blasts as God sent on the *Assyrian* Army, by which the Angel of *Jehovah* slew one Sargon in hundred fourscore and five thousand Men. *2 Kings cix, 7.* and *Psal. cxlviii, 8.* "Fire and Hail, Snow and Vapour, and stormy Wind, fulfill his Word." These are his Angels, Servants and Ministers; and of these the Text speaks, when it says,
let

let all the Gods, LXX. and New-Testament, Angels of God, worship him : All the World but the Israelites, called these Angels, Aleim Gods ; and the Scripture often speaks of them under that Title, as *int. al. Psal. xcvi. and xcvi. just cited ;* though they were not as we are often told, entitled to the Name.

The eighth Psalm wonders at the Preference given to Men before these mighty Agents, ver. 4, 5, " When I consider the Heavens, the Work of thy Fingers, the Moon and the Stars, which thou hast ordained, what is Man that thou art mindful of him ? And the Son of Man that thou visitest him ? *Thou hast made him to stand in Need a little while of the Gods, LXX. and New-Testament, a little lower than the Angels.*" And much Dispute there is about the Meaning of the latter Part of the fifth Verse ; as well as why the Version substitutes *Angels* for *Gods* in the Original. If it means the same Gods, as before, viz. the Heavens, and which Man is here compared with, the Reason of rendering *Aleim* Gods, by *Angels* would be the same as before, and explanatory ; and the Sense clear, that God has made Man to stand in need of these material or ætherial Gods, his Agents, a little while ; but in due Time would raise him above them all ; render him independent of them ; and in *Christ* their Head, subject them all to his Power. These Angels and Powers were made subject to *Christ* as well as the wicked Spirits ; the good ones voluntarily submitting.

Our

Our Lord shewed his Power over both when on Earth: But his Body stood in Need of the Strength of the Expansion, and the Life of Light and Spirit, as much as ours do now; and was as naturally subject to the Influence of the Air. But at his Resurrection the eternal Light and eternal Spirit, became its Supporters, and rendered it a glorified and spiritual Body; not subject to the Power of the Air, or *standing in need* of any Assistance from it, **וְנִצְחָה** has no other Sense than *Need, Want, Necessity*: The Verb, *to want, stand in need*; here with the *Mem* prefixed to **אֵלֶיהֶם**, to want or stand in need of something *of*, or *from* them. This Word occurs again, *Ecol. iv. 8.* and no where else with a *Mem* after it. "For whom do I labour, and **מַחְסֹר** my Soul of good?" Let it want what is good, or stand in need of it; when it was in his Power to supply that Want. And there is an Ambiguity both in the *Hebrew* and *English*; the Phrase being liable to be taken two Ways, to *want*, or *stand in need* of any thing; signifying both to be *without*, and to have Need or Occasion, for it. It occurs in Scripture in the latter Sense, *Deut. xv. 8.* "Lend him sufficient for *his need*." xxviii. 48. "in Want of all Things." *Prov. vi. 11.* "Thy Want as an armed Man." And so our Version takes it, *1 Sam. xxi. 15.* "Have I need of Mad Men." And indeed it is impossible to separate these two Senses of *Want* or *Need*; or rather to divide the *Idea* of *Want* and *Ne-*
used

cessity; that the Word may not be properly
 used both Ways. So a literal Version of the
Hebrew in the Psalm before us is, "Thou
 "madest, or hast made, him to stand in need
 "a little while *of* the Gods," meaning as
 I apprehend from a Comparison with other
 Places, and from the Context here, those
Angels or *Agents*, the Heavens, then commonly
 called *Gods*, though they were not so: Being
 only Fire, Light, Wind, Blasts of Air;
 and in a Word, *Legates* of our God, as the
 New-Testament calls them. And these are
 commanded to worship or submit to *Christ*.
 And the *Psalmist* is surprized that God should
 regard Man so much before them. Man is
 but Flesh, a gross and corruptible Composition.
 A House of Clay, whose Foundation is in
 Dust. A Garment Moth-eaten, that wastes
 by natural Decay, every Moment rotting;
 and consuming of his own Accord. And the
 little while he struggles under his Infirmities,
 owes his Subsistence, nay the very Cohesion of
 the Dust of his Body, to the Expansion and
 Pressure of the Heavens. The Heavens are a
 pure Substance, unmixed, durable, and strong;
he hath also established them for ever and ever.
 "They neither labour nor are weary, nor
 "cease from their Works. Not one of them
 "hindereth another, and they shall never dis-
 "obey his Voice." What Comparison is
 there betwixt them and Man, with respect to
 Strength, Durableness and Glory. "They
 "live all, and remain for ever, for all Uses;
 "and

" and they are all obedient." — This his
 " Ornament, the clear Firmament, the Beauty
 " of the Heaven so glorious to behold ;" what
 is Dust and Ashes, in Comparison with it ?
 The Scriptures in great Number of Places
 give it the Preference. And yet Man now, so
 much its Inferior in Perfection, and so depen-
 dant on it, shall be exalted in Glory above it ;
 become more durable than the Elements ; and
 and *be as the Sun* (to speak in the highest
 Terms Nature affords us) *when he goes forth*
in his Might. " When I consider thy Hea-
 " vens, the Work of thy Fingers—what is
 " Man, whom thou hast subjected to the
 " Heavens, thy Angels ; that thou should so
 " value him as to crown him with Glory,
 " Honour and Immortality ? Thou pro-
 " misedst him Heaven and Earth : And in
 " Earnest of thy Performance, thou hast sub-
 " jected the Earth to his Dominion." This
 seems the Purport of the *Psalm* ; and the
Psalmist is surprized that Men now in such a
 State of Subjection, should be so highly ex-
 alted above those very *Angels*, that are at
 present so much more excellent than he. But
 this is absurd to Dr. Sharp, and he can see
 no honourable Preference given to the Son, by
 saying such Things to him, as could not have been
 said to inanimate Creatures. It is an amazing
 Preference in David's Sight however. And a
 most glorious Exaltation, after having been for
 a while subject to their Controul, and depen-

dent

dent on their Assistance, every Moment, for
 Life and Breath, to be set free from their
 Slavery, and be made Lord and Master over
 them; the Author of our Salvation being ex-
 alted above every Thing that was called Gods.
 And the *Psalmist* does *most undoubtedly* speak
 of the *material caelestial Agents*, *Psalm xcvi.*
and xcvi. when he bids them, under the
 Title of Gods, to worship the Lord of the
 whole Earth. And it may not be altogether
 so *undoubted*, though so learned a Com-
 mentator, as Dr. *Sharp*, so peremptorily
 affirms, that the Apostle, *Heb. i.* is extolling
 the Son, whose Title is God, in respect of
 Dignity and Power, before the *created Angels*,
 because the reasoning would be *incongruous*,
 and the Argument inconclusive, that he is
 God, because more excellent than any other
 Creature; and, in my humble Opinion, the
 Apostle is shewing the high Dignity to which
 the *Humanity of Christ* was exalted for the
suffering of Death, as chap. ii. 9. where he
 plainly and directly construes, the *Exaltation*
above all Things, to be that of *Jesus, who, for*
the Suffering of Death, was crowned with
Glory and Honour. But the *Arians* always ap-
 ply to the Son whose Title is God, what is spoke
 of the Son whose Title is Man, and so make
 the Godhead of *Christ* inferior to that of the
 Person, whom we distinguish by the Title of
Father; and you may sooner expect to con-
 vince a profest *Arian* or *Deist*, than one, who
 thinks

thinks himself an orthodox Believer of the Divinity of *Christ*, whilst he only represents him as the highest of Creatures.

“ The Texts for the Ministration of Angels at Mount *Sinai*, in the Old-Testament, are, *Deut.* xxxiii. 2. and *Psal.* lxxviii. 17. In the New-Testament, they are, *Acts* vii. 53. and *Gal.* iii. 19.” says an Author, who seems to think, that the Word *Angel* is applied to but one Subject; and did not care to see, that the *Angel of the Lord*, who, *Acts* vii. and *Gal.* iii. gave the Law, was *Jehovah*, as explained at large by Mr. *H—n*. The other two Places do not mention the Word *Angel*; but *Deut.* xxxiii. as translated, says, “ The Lord — came *with* ten thousands of Saints.” But, by what Rule of Grammar, Usage or Authority, is *הוּא* *he came* *ו* to be construed, *he came with*? The Preposition *ו*, as it is here, doth not signify *with*, but *from*; and is construed so three Times in this very Verse: “ The Lord came *from* *Sinai*, and rose up *from* *Seir*; he shined forth *from* Mount *Paran*,” and why not render it by *from* in the next Words: “ He came *from* *רַבְבֹּת*” whatever that Word signifies? And if it means *ten thousands*, this Text disproves what it is brought for; for then God came *from* them, and not *with* them. It is asserted further, that *רַבְבֹּת* signifies a Myriad, and “ never occurs with any other Construction: If

" If any Dependence may be had on the
 " Agreement of all the Versions, or the ob-
 " vious Sense of the Texts themselves." The
 Author had unluckily overlooked, *Ezek. xvi.*
 " 7. *I made thee רבבה* as the Bud of the
 " Field." *Pag.* renders it *decem millia ve-*
luti germen. The LXX. and Vulgate, *mul-*
tiplicatam, as our *Englisch*, *I caused thee to*
multiply; though the Margin says, *Heb.*
made thee a Million: But, *made thee a Mil-*
lion as a Bud, is not Sense. The Com-
 parison seems plain, that God made them
Greatness, as a Plant grows to, by Degrees;
 and the *Noun Substantive* for the *Adjective* is
 very frequent, see *int. al. Deut. xxviii. 25.*
 I appeal to the *obvious Sense of the Text*, that
 רבבה is a Noun here, *Great or Greatness*,
 and not a Numeral; and I suppose, it is the
 Name of a Place in *Kadesh*, *Deut. xxxiii. 2.*
 as the other Places in the Verse where, or
 thereabouts. I have endeavoured to explain
 this whole Passage, *Integrity of the Heb.*
Text, p. 74. against the reverend Mr. *Ken-*
negutt, who thought it so obscure, that he was
 forced to correct it, in order to make Sense of
 it. The Context would lead one to think it
 the Name of a Place; because *Sinai*, *Seir*
 and *Paran*, whence God is said to come
 also, were Places from which God displayed
 his *Greatness and his Glory* in the Sight of
 his own and the neighbouring People; and
 they are all proper Words for Names of the
 Places

Places where the great and majestic Scene was exhibited, this Passage alludes to: But further, St. *Jude* says, that *Enoch* prophesied of the Day of Judgment; and that the Lord should come with his *holy Myriads*; and St. *Paul*, *Heb.* xii. 22. mentions *Millions of Angels* in Heaven, which are joined by the *Spirits of just Men made perfect*; and how far these Passages may countenance the Notion of the *Angels* being at *Sinai*, or the Construction of רבבות by *Myriads*, must be left to every one's own Judgment, see *Discourse on Cherubim*, p. 375. *et seq.* The learned Author sums up the Force of the Evidence in saying, *there is nothing incongruous in the Application of the Word to Angels*: Which is but slender Proof, that it is so applied in the Text under Consideration; for the good Angels (who are a numerous Host, as well as the ætherial Hosts) being to be present at the last Judgment of Men, at which the fallen Angels will also be present, is no Proof, that either one or the other were present at the giving the Law; or, that the good ones are the Assistants of Men on Earth.

The next Text is *Psal.* lxxviii. 17. in the *English*, "The Chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of *Angels*; the Lord is among them, as in *Sinai*, in the Holy Place." Dr. *Sharp's* Comment upon it is but short, and he doth not give any other Reason for the Addition of the Word

Word *Angels* to the Text, or, for understanding it of Angels; but, that "it is agreed" by most who have commented on the "Place;" and who agree scarce in any Thing else, or the Doctor with them, but in bringing *Sinai* into the Sanctuary; which, how it was done, or what they mean by it, remains a Mystery to me.

Jehovah came down in Fire on Mount *Sinai*, in the Clouds of Heaven; and as *Number* is put for *Greatness*, as before referred to, and the Power of God round *Elisba* is represented by an infinite Number of Horses and רכב *Chariots of Fire round about him*, there is Reason for saying, that the *Myriads of Chariots* in this Psalm, were of the same Sort; and it is literally true, that God was in them at *Sinai*, בקדש in the holy one, *sc.* Angel, whom *his Name* and his Presence are said to be in; or in *his Holiness*, i. e. in Person. רכב is regularly one that rides, presides, or drives a Chariot; and the Text comes to the same, whether you render it the Drivers of the Chariots, or the *Chariots of God*, are Myriads: Because a Charioteer supposes a Chariot; as a Chariot doth a Charioteer. They who construe it *Equitatus, La Chevalerie*, the Cavalry, speak to my poor Understanding, which can form no Idea of *Angels* being a Coach or Chariot, any more than of Men or Horses being so. "But" that *Angels* are meant, it is said—is agreed

F

" by

“ by most who have commented on the “ Place.” But what Sort of Angels? I suppose, they mean the good Angels or happy Spirits; in what Sense they are *Chariots*, remains to be explained. One would have thought, that, among the many Texts produced by Mr. H——n, to explain the *Nature*, or shew of what Species the Chariots, or the Powers that drove the Chariot of God were, *Psal. civ. 3.* would have put the Matter out of Dispute: *Who maketh the Clouds his Chariots, and walketh, or moveth, upon the Wings of the Wind.* Clouds and Darknes, and a mighty Tempest, with Flames of devouring Fire, round about him at *Sinai*, and his constant Equipage when he made his publick Appearance to the Church, during their miraculous Life in the Wilderness. And accordingly Dr. *Sharp* faintly cites one Half of it, without disputing the Inference; only says, “ He seems, to himself, to have rid his “ *Hands* of the Ministry of Angels at *Sinai*.” And it is to be supposed, the Doctor would have rid his Hands of the Text, had he known how, instead of leaving it to the Reader’s Judgment, who, it is to be hoped, has got some *intelligible*, though not too *sublime and poetical* a Notion to be understood, of the Chariot, and Drivers of the Chariot of God, and of the Chariot of the Cherubim; for they were the same. *Isaiab xix. 1.* as before cited, “ The Lord *rideth* upon a swift
“ Cloud;

" Cloud ;" which is another Text that determines the Nature of the Chariot or Chariots of God ; and Clouds, as well as the Lights and Flames of Fire in the Heavens, are without Number ; and may, and have been shewn in Myriads by him who made them, and commands them when and where he pleases.

Not only the Appearances of *Jehovah* are called Angels, and his *material Legate* also, whether acting in the whole Expansion, or any of its three *Names*, or any of its numerous Parts, in any particular Place, or any particular Occasion : Not only these are Angels, but every common Messenger carries that Name in Scripture, whether employed by God or Man. Thus *Haggai*, i. 13. is called *the Angel of the Lord, in his Business*; translated, *the Lord's Messenger, in the Lord's Message*; and so are the Prophets in general : *Rev. xvii. 1.* " There came one of the seven " Angels, which had the seven Phials, and " talked with me, saying unto me, come " hither, and I will shew unto thee the " Judgment of the great Whore," (Idolatry or spiritual Fornication, which began at *Babel*) " that sitteth upon many Waters, " having over-run all Nations." Chap. xix. 19. " I fell at his Feet to worship him ; and " he said, see thou do it not. I am thy Fellow " Servant, and of thy Brethren that have the " Testimony of *Jesus* : Worship God, for " the Testimony of *Jesus* is the Spirit of

" Prophecy." So again chap. xxi. 9. " There
 " came to me one of the seven An-
 " gels, which had the seven Phials full of the
 " seven last Plagues." Chap. xxii. 8, 9. " I
 " fell down to worship before the Feet of the
 " Angel, which shewed me these Things.
 " Then saith he unto me, see thou do it not;
 " for I am thy Fellow Servant, and of thy
 " Brethren, the Prophets." *Seven* Prophets
 are here the Representation of all who had
 the Testimony of *Jesus*, or *Spirit of Pro-*
phesy; and had predicted the Wrath to come.
 So the Text explains *seven*, chap. xv. 1. " For
 " in them is *filled up* the Wrath of God."
 If the Wrath of God be filled up in these
 seven Phials, or all the Wrath on the *Whore*
of Babel were contained in them, and the
seven Angels be Prophets, as follows by direct
 Inference from one of them being expressly
 called so; from these Premises, the *seven* must
 be all who predicted that Wrath: Not barely
 in Number *seven*; but, because *Prophecy* had
 fully predicted the Judgments of God on the
Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the
Earth. The Prophets predicted the Judg-
 ments of God, and appointed their Time of
 coming; and this is called their *executing*
them. Jer. i. 10. " See, I have this Day
 " set thee over the Nations, and over the
 " Kingdoms, to root out and to pull down,
 " and to destroy and throw down, to build
 " and to plant." So 1 Kings xix. 17. " Him
 " that

“ that escapeth the Sword of *Jehu*, shall
 “ *Elisba* slay.” That is, shall declare or ap-
 point who shall. This is explained, *Hos.* vi.
 5. “ I hewed them by the Prophets: I have
 “ slain them by the Words of my Mouth.”
 These Angels, or Prophets, had the Phials of
 Wrath, as having been *set over the Nations,*
to root out and pull down; and to destroy and
throw down. The Words of God in their
 Mouth, (*Jer.* v. 14.) being Fire to destroy,
 and a Sword to slay. The Judgments of God
 were then coming upon the Earth; and what
 God had so often threatened, was now to be
 executed. *Hag.* ii. 21. “ I will shake the
 “ Heavens and the Earth; and I will
 “ overthrow the Throne of Kingdoms; and
 “ I will destroy the Strength of the King-
 “ doms of the Heathen; and I will over-
 “ throw the Chariots, and those that ride in
 “ them; and the Horses and their Riders
 “ shall come down, every one by the Sword
 “ of his Brother.” The Prophets were in-
 structed by *Signs*, such as St. *John* saw, tho’
 more sparingly; and they have left their Pre-
 dictions mostly in *Language*; but the Lan-
 guage is lofty and sublime, and the Thoughts
 fetched from those Symbols; and whoever
 will put into *Figures*, or draw in Pictures,
 what they have said in Words; or put into
 Words, what is shewn him in *Signs*, will
 find, that he *saw* no more than they had
 predicted. The *Angels* are the Prophets

because they were God's *Messengers*; the Phials of Wrath, the Denunciations of that Wrath; their having them, their being commissioned to predict the Wrath; their now pouring them out, the now Execution of their Predictions; *seven*, because in that Number is *Fulness*; the seven Phials being the *Fulness* of the Wrath of God, because *in them it is filled up*. We are not to look on each *Plague* as a distinct Act of judicial Justice. The Fall of *Babylon*, *Ægypt*, and many other Places and Countries is expressed in all these Sorts of Metaphors; of Famine, Pestilence, Fire, smiting the Rivers, turning their Waters into Blood, scorching the Fruits of the Ground, burning and dissolving the Mountains, darkening the Sun and Moon, and so on. Thus for a Specimen, *Rev. xvi. 2.* "The first Angel
 " poured out his Phial upon the Earth; and
 " there fell a noisom and grievous Sore upon
 " the Men, which had the Mark of the
 " Beast." *Deut. xxviii. 35.* "The Lord
 " shall smite thee with a sore Botch in the
 " Knees and in the Legs, that cannot be
 " healed." This was verified in *Isaiah's*
 Time, chap. i. 6. "From the Sole of the
 " Foot even to the Head, there is no Sound-
 " ness in it; but Wounds and Bruises, and
 " putrifying Sores." And the other Phials
 contained the Judgments summed up, *Ezek.*
xxxviii. 19. et seq. "There shall be a great
 " Shaking in the Land of *Israel*, so that the
 " Fishes

“ Fishes of the Sea, and the Fowls of the
 “ Heaven, and the Beasts of the Field, and
 “ all creeping Things that creep upon the
 “ Earth, and all the Men that are upon the
 “ Face of the Earth, shall shake at my Pre-
 “ sence; and the Mountains shall be thrown
 “ down.” — “ I will plead against him with
 “ Pestilence and with Blood, and I will rain
 “ upon him, and upon his Bands, and upon
 “ the many People that are with him, an
 “ overflowing Rain, and great Hail Stones,
 “ Fire and Brimstone.” Thus does *Ezekiel*,
 one of the Angels of God, pour out his Phial
 upon Man and Beast, upon the Sea, upon the
 Waters, and all Things in them; and upon
 the Air; and upon the Seat of the Beast in
 Darkness; and in Blood; and in Fire; as all
 the other Prophets do their Phials in the
 same Expressions. They darken the Sun,
 turn the Moon into Blood, burn the Moun-
 tains, make the Land tremble,; they send a
 Thirst that cannot be quenched, and Famine
 with the Pestilence upon them. And *Moses*
 literally gave the *Ægyptians* nothing but
 Blood to drink; which, *Wisd.* xi. 6. is ex-
 plained, as *St. John* does the Blood of the Sea
 and Rivers: “ Instead of a Fountain of run-
 “ ning Water, the Enemies were troubled at
 “ the corrupt Blood, which was to rebuke
 “ the Commandment of killing the Chil-
 “ dren.” So *Rev.* xvi. 5. “ Thou art
 “ righteous, O Lord — because thou hast
 “ judged

“ judged thus ; for they have shed the Blood
 “ of the Saints and Prophets, and thou hast
 “ given them Blood to drink.” There is
 scarce a Curse in the whole Apocalypse, but
 what is mentioned, 2 *Esd.* xv. and xvi. and
 that in almost the same Terms.

A great Critick, and very learned Com-
 mentator on Scripture, in the rabbinical Way,
 has objected against the hieroglyphical Mean-
 ing of the Number *seven* ; because it consists
 of one, two, three, &c. and I just mention
 it, because the Construction of the Word
Angel, and the Key to these misterious Scenes
 in the Revelation, does, in a great Measure,
 depend upon it. His Words are, *Disc.*
on Cherubim p. 353. “ Though $\epsilon\pi\lambda$ should
 “ be supposed to stand in other Places for
 “ שבע in the Sense of *sufficient*, it cannot do
 “ so in this Place ; because *these Angels* are
 “ recounted in the next Chapter in their Or-
 “ der, $\delta\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\circ\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, &c. the Article $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$
 “ likewise forbids the *understanding* $\epsilon\pi\lambda$ of a
 “ sufficient Number.”

Seven undoubtedly consists of one, two,
 three, &c. but that is no Proof, that *seven*
 were not hieroglyphically shewn to express
Fulness ; and so the Text positively explains
 the *seven Phials*, because *in them was filled up*
the Wrath of God. So the Spirit of *Jehovah*,
Isaiab xi. 2. on the Branch of *Jesse*, is rec-
 koned up in one, two, &c. to the Number of
seven. *Christ* is drawn as “ a Lamb with
 “ seven

“ seven Horns and seven Eyes, which are the
 “ seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the
 “ Earth.” And no doubt there were one,
 two, &c. down to seven, of Horns and Eyes;
 neither of which imply any Thing but *Ful-*
ness of what Horn and Eye signify. So *Franc.*
Junius and others, in their Notes on the *Re-*
velation, published with Queen *Elizabeth's* Bi-
 ble, understand it, chap. i. 4. “ Grace be to you,
 “ and Peace from him, which was, and which
 “ is, and which is to come; and from the *seven*
 “ *Spirits*, which are before his Throne.”
 Note, “ That is from the Holy Ghost,
 “ which proceedeth from the Father and the
 “ Son: This Spirit is one in Person according
 “ to his Subsistence; but in Communication
 “ of his Virtue, and in Demonstration of his
 “ divine Works in those seven Churches,
 “ does so perfectly manifest himself, as if
 “ there were so many Spirits, every one per-
 “ fectly working in his own Church.”
 Wherefore after, chap. v. 6. they are called,
 “ the seven Horns and seven Eyes of the
 “ Lamb; as much as to say, *his most abso-*
 “ *lute Power and Wisdom.*” And they prove,
 by several Arguments, that these seven Eyes,
 Horns and Spirits, are the one Spirit of God;
 and have not the least Apprehension, that there
 were not *seven* exhibited in Number: Without
 which, the Idea of *Fulness*, *Completion*, or
Perfection, had not been given *figuratively*.
 And indeed the Reason which Dr. *Sharp*
 urges

urges against the Construction of *seven*, in these mysterious Scenes, *viz.* that there actually were *seven*, or “one, two, &c. down to “seven,” is a *fine quâ non* of conveying that Idea, which is annexed to the Number *seven*, not to the Words *επτα*, or *שבע* only; but to the Number. The Number therefore must be shewn, where that Idea is designed to be conveyed, as much as other Signs were, when Ideas were designed to be conveyed by them. And were as good a Critick as Dr. Sharp to argue against the Design of a modern political Piece, suppose, that the Lion could not be *England*, because the Painter had actually drawn the very Parts of the Creature, it would be of a Piece with the reasoning above; but whether the Objector would be thought in earnest, or wretchedly trifling, admits of little Dispute. And I am sorry to say, that the Doctor weakly and wilfully mistakes and twists Mr. H——n’s Construction of *seven*, when he says, “The Article “*τοῖς* likewise forbids the *understanding* *επτα*, “of a sufficient Number; which Translation “would run as uncouthly here, as the following “Version, *αι επτα πληγαι των επτα αγγελων*, would “in the next Verse, *viz.* And no Man was “able to enter into the Temple, till a *suffi-* “cient Number of Plagues of a sufficient “Number of Agents were fulfilled.” Does Mr. H——n dispute the Propriety of the Translation of *επτα* by *seven*? Or suppose there

there were not *one, two, three, &c.* to seven, of the Angels? No, by no means. And yet this is what the Doctor's Manner of stating his Objection supposes. *The Translation*, he says, *would run uncouthly*. St. John seeth a Sign, or symbolic Vision, and describes what he saw. Mr. H——n attempts to explain the Picture; and Dr. Sharp mistakes the Explanation of the Parts of the Picture for a *Version* of the Words the Apostle describes what he saw in. The good Doctor, it is plain, saw the *Sophism*, which turns upon substituting *Translation* in the latter Part of the Sentence, for *Understanding* in the former. We may understand *על* of a *sufficient Number*, without translating it so. As a *Numeral*, and in a Description of the Picture it must be translated *seven*; but in an Explication of *the Sign*, Mr. H——n understood it of a *sufficient Number*; and whether he was right or wrong in that Notion, he never offers *sufficient Number*, as a proper Translation of *על*; nor was so enamoured with Hebrew Diction, and Etymologies, as to overlook the Meaning of *one, two, three, in other Tongues*, which our candid Doctor sneers him for. A very ingenious Writer observes, that, “The most forward to deride, are most incapable, or most *unwilling*, to understand.” And the Doctor has taken a great deal of Pains here to deceive himself and his Reader; though the Juggle is so artless, and lays so open, that any

any one may see it. He would oppose Mr. *H—n*'s Explication of the Symbol of *seven*, by shewing, that *full*, or *sufficient*, is not a proper Translation of the Word here; and tells us, it cannot be *understood* so, because there really were *seven* in Number; and, by a little Slight of Hand, puts *Version* for *Explication* upon you. And this has been his constant Method through the whole Controversy, twisting and perverting, mistating and misrepresenting what he proposed to confute; besides some down right false Charges, and *impious Suppositions* put upon Mr. *H—n*, which, though often complained of, he has never yet had Time or Candour enough, to retract and acknowledge. I was in Hopes to have found a candid Enquirer, not a wrangling Disputant, in Dr. *Sharp*; a fair Adversary, and not a meer *Jesuit*. But enough of this; and believe the Reader will not think me *abusive*, or trespassing on the Bounds of *good Manners*, when such Artifices are to be complained of, that trespass so far upon what is really *good Manners*, that Complaisance can have no Place. I shall not now enter into the mysterious Scenes of the *Revelation*, though I hope, it would not be daring and presumptuous, to do it. All Scripture was given by Inspiration, and is profitable; though the plainest has been wrested to bad Purposes. But he is an Enemy to the Truth of God, who represents it as *daring and presumptuous* to enquire

enquire after the Meaning of any Part. The utmost Care and Humility should attend such a Study. The Eye should be single, and the Heart free and open; and we should be doubly careful in commenting upon these Parts that have given a Handle to so much Revery and Madness: But to represent it as daring and presumptuous to enter into them, is a daring Presumption itself.

Thus I have gone through with the several *Subjects*, the Word *Angel* is applied to in Scripture, and touched upon the most disputed Passages that Word occurs in. And the principal Point I have had in View, has been to shew that the Angel of the Lord, or of God, is an assumed Appearance of God, and who calls himself by that Name, and speaks and acts, as if he were the numerical Person or Persons. And the Phrase is used from the Form assumed, and his own immediate Agency, *outwardly* and *sensibly* to those, whom *Jehovah* is said to appear to.

The Authors of the *Cabala*, were the blind Guides who led the Christian World into the Notion of *Guardian Angels*, and all the Idolatry built upon it. Their View was to confound the Evidence for the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity; and mislead us from a Sight that gives ocular Proof of there being three Persons and one God. As also to represent the *Cberubim* as real Angels at *Eden*, and Figures

gures of them in the Tabernacle and Temple.
And indeed,

The CHERUBIM

Were Figures representing *the true* Guardian Angels, *Jehovah Aleim* and their *Christ*; who is taken into their Essence, substantially united to the eternal Light. And I propose to consider the Texts where they are mentioned, and collect the Particulars relating to them, and lay the whole before the Reader, in as short a Compass, as the Nature of the Subject will admit of.

The first Mention of *Cherubim*, is, *Gen. iii. 24.* which was very early; immediately after the Fall, and the Re-promise of eternal Life, through Faith in the Son of God, who was to be the *Seed of the Woman*, or, *Son of a Virgin*.

“ The Lord God—drove out the Man,
“ and שכן *inhabited*, at the East of the Gar-
“ den of *Eden*, *Cherubs*; and אח להט
“ החרב המתהפכת the *flaming Fire rolling*
“ upon itself: to keep the Way of the Tree
“ of Life.”

The Reason given for removing Man out of *Paradise*, is, “ lest he put forth his Hand,
“ and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat
“ and live for ever.” That is, *eat that he may live*; or attempt to take the Benefit of that *sacramental Tree*; which he could not do, at that Time, because he had sinned; and
though

though he was pardoned, it was but conditionally; and it was necessary his Redeemer should die before he could be restored to Life, first in *Type*; then at the Fulness of Time in *Person*. That *eat and live*, means, *eat that he may live*, see *inter al.* Gen. xxx. 20. "I have learnt by Experience וִיבִרְכֵנִי that the Lord hath blest me for thy Sake." And Lam. i. 19. "they sought them Meat וְשִׁבְרוּ to relieve their Souls." And this is the Force of the ׀ in other Places. The Tree of Life was stored with *sacramental* Food, and they were to eat of it, as we may judge from the Nature of a Sacrament, to acknowledge a Dependance on the true Source of Life; and as the last Act of religious Worship, to express their Hopes of Life from him who appointed it, or as we call it consecrated the Tree, to this *mystical Purpose of Life as its Name implies*. Adam knew the Nature of his Crime, and the Condition of his Pardon; and embraced the Promise in the Name he gave Eve, the Mother of כָּל חַי every one that liveth, sc. to God: Those who should be without Hope and lay in Sin, being dead. And the Reason Adam assigns for the new Name he gave our first Mother, bespeaks itself, that his first View was to her being the Mother of him *with whom our Life is hid in God* *.

Adam was con-

* Col. iii. 3. "Ye are dead, and your Life is hid with Christ in God." Joh. iii. 3. "Except a Man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God."

conditionally restored to eat of the Tree of Life ; *i. e.* to what, eating of it meant. But he was to die and rise again first. The Type was forfeited, and *new Means* of spiritual Life were appointed ; by Faith in *Christ* : And consequently some *visible Signs*, which were as necessary for the Body, as Faith to the Soul. What was it then the *Cberubim* were to keep ? The Text says, *the Way of the Tree of Life*. But which Tree ; the Type or the Antitype ? The Antitype was re-promised ; seen a far off, and laid hold on, and thence we conclude it means *that Tree*, in the Way to which he was now to walk, and this was the *same Antitype* to the Tree in the Garden. It is highly probable, nay we may certainly conclude, since the contrary is not mentioned, that the Tree was left standing. And the common Supposition is, that the *Cberubim* were to keep *Adam* by Force from coming at it. This contradicts the Design of Religion ; and Nature of a Sacrament. Religion requires the Heart, and must convince the Mind : *To design*, is with God, *to have performed*. The Man *in foro Conscientiæ* has already committed what he hath wished to do. And therefore, it could answer no End to keep *Adam* by Force from eating of the Tree. And what would eating have done ? No material Fruit can give Immortality : That is impossible. This Tree could be nothing but a Memorial or Pledge of Immortality ; the Name a Memorial

memorial, that God had promised Life eternal. The eating of it, a Pledge, in a sacramental Way, that God would in due Time give them that Food which should endure to everlasting Life. As the Type bears the Name of the Antitype, or the Sign and Thing signified have the same Name: So here, The Tree of Life the *Cherubim* were to keep, was that which *Adam* had lost, and was by Grace in proper Time to be restored to. He never was to have the Use of the outward material Tree, as a Sacrament, again; but he was to have the real *antitypical Tree* at his Resurrection, and not before. Life eternal he was to inherit; but there was a new Way appointed to lead him to it. And therefore put this Sentence out of its sacramental Dress, and it says, "The Cherubim and the Glory around them, with the divine Presence in them, were to keep the Way of Life eternal." To shew them the Way, and keep them from losing of it; which must be by instructing their Minds. As a Record of the Promises, and Chartel of the Terms of Salvation, keeping up the Knowledge that was necessary to make them wise unto Salvation. This hieroglyphical Light was to direct the Way as a Guide, and keep it, as the Angel kept their Way in the Wilderness against all Opposers, whether from Ignorance or Force; it was a Light to their Paths and a Lamp to their Feet; it was the Word of God written

in those Characters, which were the only ones Mankind had, till God revealed the more short and concise Way of writing, the present; and perhaps more determinate Way, by Letters. And the *Cberubical Apparatus* was set up to keep the Way to what was *couched* under the sacramental Tree in *Paradise*.

But why does *Moses* speak in that Language that seems so liable to deceive, and naturally leads one to think of that consecrated Fruit-Tree in the Garden *Adam* was just driven out of; especially, when he was driven out, lest he should eat of that very Tree? The Answer I think is very obvious: Life eternal had been promised him *under that Sign*. That Tree was the Shadow of it; and though he had forfeited both the *Sign* and *Thing signified*, he was restored to the latter; and the new Promise is worded in the old Terms, because the *real Substance* was given him again. He was used to that Language, knew what the Tree of Life meant. It was saying, "Though you must believe, obey, and die first, yet *the same Happiness* is preserved for you, which that Tree was a Sign of. The same essential Tree stands in the *Paradise* of God, which the Tree in your *Paradise* was a Figure of. Observe the *new Institution*, and it will lead you to it. I will keep the Tree of Life for you; nothing shall rob you of it." Thus when the ceremonial Law was fulfilled and set aside, the

the legal Terms and typical Language are preserved under the new Law. *Christ's Body* is the *Temple*; his Prayers, *the Incense*; his Death and Sufferings, *the Sacrifices*; Christians are a spiritual House, and holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices; and the Body of *Christ* is spoke of under the Term of the *Temple*, without any Explication, or additional explanatory Epithet; and so of the rest. The old Terms are preserved, because the *real* and *known* Meaning of those Things, under the Law, was the same, as is given them in the New-Testament. And if People, in reading the History of *Adam*, did not rest altogether in *the Letter*, but would consider him as the Man of God, they would see, that the Tree, the *Cherubs* were to keep the Way to, was *eternal Life*. And the same Mistake is made here, which *W—n* and others have run themselves into about the Law; they take that for the Law, which was but the Picture or Description of it.

The Use and Design of the *Cherubs* and their sacred Appendages, as Keepers of the Way that leads to Life eternal, prepare us to expect a different Account of them than what the Apostate *Jews* have given us; and we must examine into every Word, to see what Light the Text itself gives us into this important Subject. The Text says, God *שכן* — which the Versions render by *placed*, or something equivalent; and the *Hebrew*, tho'

it *may* be construed to say more, *viz.* that God did dwell in them, as the divine Presence attended the sacred Institutions, yet, it must be owned, it does not absolutely follow, because Verbs in *Kal*, are so often to be construed as in *Hipbil*. But this must be observed, that had the sacred Writer intended to have said it, *the Verb* must have been in the same Mood it is. But we shall see Reason to convince us, I believe, that this was his Intention, from a Consideration of the next *Words* we are to enquire into the Meaning of.

—כְּרֻבִים Our Translation gives us this Word as it sounds according to the Points, untranslated, and frequently with the *Hebrew* Plural Termination, and our's too, and write it *Cherubims*. I chuse to write it *Cherubs*, because *Cherub* is the Singular of *Cherubim* in *Hebrew*, and *Cherubs* the Plural of *Cherub* in *English*. There is nothing said about the *Cherubs* as to what they were, in what Form or Shape, or what Materials, in this Text; and there is no *one Root* in the *Hebrew* Tongue, by which the Name can give us any Light into these Particulars; we shall therefore defer those Points to their more proper Texts. Only thus much we may conclude, that there were *two*, and, from the Usage of the Language, *but two* of them; because neither the Context or *Numeral* annexed, give us any Reason to think there were more.

The

The next Words are **אֵת לַחַט הַחֶרֶב** which all the Versions and Commentators give the same general Sense to; though none of them give you *any other* Evidence or Proof for that Sense, than that **חֶרֶב** signifies *a Sword*; and that our inveterate Enemies have said, the *Cherubs* were the blessed Angels set as Centinels to keep *Adam*, by Force, from eating of the Tree of Life; as if any perishable Fruit could, in spite of its Creator, give Immortality, or Force were to convince the Mind of Man that the Way of God was right. Some People have got it so strongly into their Heads that the Angels were really here, that they would be offended at the many Absurdities chargeable upon that Hypothesis, that it is not safe, nor indeed would it be kind, to draw them out at length. But as there is nothing but *meer Tradition* for it, and that handed down from the most inveterate Enemies of the Truth, those who are open to Conviction will enquire, why we have taken up with so strange a Notion; and consider that *Prejudice only* is no Evidence, any more than bare Possession is a Title.

חֶרֶב rendered a Sword is applied to any *destroying* Matter, to any Thing scorched or dried up; does not signify a Sword as an arbitrary, unexpressive Word; not as describing its Shape, Materials, or any other Idea belonging to a Sword, but as it is a destroying Instrument. "*Gladius*," says *Leigh*, "*a cæde*,

“ *vel a vastando—vel ab exicando*. It signifies
 “ *Destruction*; and a Sword is said to devour,
 “ 2 Sam. ii. 26.” and in this all the Lexi-
 cons agree, and Usage justifies them. It is a
 common Word for all cutting and destroying
 Instruments; it is applied to the Matter of the
 Heavens in that Condition which scorches,
 burns up and destroys. Gen. xxxi. 40. “ In
 “ the Day ~~חר~~ the Heat consumed
 “ me” *Isaiab* i. 6. “ A Shadow in the
 “ Day Time from the Heat.” xxv. 5. “ The
 “ Heat in a dry Place.” *Job* xxx. 30. “ My
 “ Bones are burnt with Heat.” The Ad-
 dition of ~~לחם~~ *flaming* to this Word, expresses
 Fire as fully as any Words could do. *Flam-*
ing is used with ~~אש~~ Fire, as well as with
~~חורב~~ *burning Matter*. *Psalms* civ. 4. “ His
 “ Ministers a flaming Fire.” This Word
Horeb became a Name for the Mountain,
 where all *Israel* saw that great Fire, which
 was the Likeness of the Glory of the Lord.
~~המרתהפכת~~ is variously rendered; and seems
 to have been thought a great Difficulty. Our
 present *English* says, as do the LXX. and Vul-
 gate, “ *which turned every Way*.” But what
 Sword doth not turn every Way? Our for-
 mer Translation, “ the Blade of a Sword
 “ shaken.” But what is *shaken*? They sup-
 posed perhaps that the Angels brandished or
 shook the Sword at Adam. ~~הפך~~ is to
 turn over, and in *Hithpael* is, as *Pagnine*
 translates it, *vertens se*, turning itself over, or
 over

over upon itself; and so changing Condition or Situation by turning over. But how could a Sword turn itself? One would have thought the Angels should have had it, and turned it about. And how came there to be but one Sword between two of them? It would be a very uncouth Expression for a General to say, "He set two Centinels and a Sword to keep Watch." The common easy Solution of many Difficulties, that it is an *Hebraism*, will not do here; unless something parallel to *a Guard and a Sword for an armed Guard*, be produced. The Word is very expressive of the Motion of Fire, which continually rolls in Waves back upon itself; especially where confined as in a Cloud, Furnace, or any thing arched over it; and answer exactly to מְלִקְחָתוֹ *Ezek. i. 4. infolding, catching itself, sese Reciprocans*, the Word for the Motion of that great Fire in the Cloud, which the *Cherubs* were shewn in on the Banks of the *Chebar*. *Daniel*, chap. vii. 9. Describes it as a *Stream of Fire rolling forth in Waves of Flame*; where Wave rolls upon Wave, and the Matter in continual Agitation is always changing Place with itself. No properer Word could be used for the *Involutions and Evolutions* of Fire.

Ezekiel's Cherubs were in Fire. And Fire as we have seen, was the usual Chariot or Equipage of the Divinity, and what God came down in to the Earth. *Fire* being a com-

mon Word for the *divine Glory*; and implying a Cloud it burnt in, (which the Reader will recollect from the several Phrases the *divine Glory* is spoken of in, before cited;) and *Glory* being the Residence of *Jehovah*, and of the *Cherubs* at the *Chebar*, and in the *Tabernacle* and *Temple*, we thence conclude, that the Fire at *Eden* was that *Cloud, Glory* or *Chariot*, which these *representative Great Ones* were placed in. Thence *St. Paul* calls those on the Ark, the *Cherubim of Glory*. This is no trifling Subject, and though I do not know of one single Writer, I can cite to blunt the Edge of *Novelty*, that some may object; or evade the Charge of *Presumption* and *Pride* to pretend to explain what all have failed in, yet Truth, if it be Truth, will prevail at last; and neither the Sneers of the Malevolent, or Artifices of the wrangling Disputants, shall give me any Concern. If there be *Evidence* in Scripture that has not been produced in its full Force, it is to be wished it were; and he that ridicules it for having been *latent*, would have done so by that which was produced by the inspired Expositors themselves; as some who thought themselves the Orthodox Defenders of the Faith treated the Explanations of the Apostles; and though the Apostles were supported by Miracles, some mocked, and others more enraged, laid violent Hands on them! Here the Case is widely different, and *new* Explanations should be justly suspected; but he

he that *grins* at them, meerly for being *new*, is not seeking Truth in the Love of Truth. *La Raillerie flote entre l'outrage & l'impertinence ; tout railleur est sot ou offençant ;* says a modern Author of great Sense. The infidel Authors of the *partial Monthly Censure*, have put Lord *Shaftsbury's* Weapon into a Hand that is better qualified it is to be hoped, than disposed to make use of it. They designed it perhaps as a Compliment, but it is the severest Censure they could have passed upon him. See *Brown's* elegant Essay on the Characteristicks, p. 105. second Edition. That Weapon is fit only to be used in Support of Falshood against Truth, which it fights against in Disguise. It requires Lord *Shaftsbury's* Head and Heart both to make any Figure with it. And cannot be used either with Success or Consistency, but in a bad Cause. But the Scorpions seem to boast of their supposed Ally, and think that a Commendation, which every good Man would blush at. It must be confessed, the Gentry are in Character, while they make an Imperfection the Object of their Pleasure and Commendation, for *Dust* is the Serpent's Food.

Mr. *H*——— has sufficiently explained the *Form* and *Design* of that important and antient Hieroglyphic under Consideration, and taught Men to read the Bible *Adam* himself learnt Christianity from; and by which the grand Lines of it were preserved till the *Law*

in Writing was added to it. And the *flaming Sword* which *turned every Way* being proved, as I flatter myself, to be an exact Description of the Cloud of Glory or Chariot, the *Cberubs* were placed in, will help us to remove many Objections brought against his Account of them, as well as some that have been raised against Christianity itself.

The *Cberubical Apparatus* being placed at *Eden*, to keep up the Knowledge and Means of Life eternal; afford many great and important Inferences. It settles the Dispute about the Antiquity of Christianity; and of the *Law*, as well as the Origin and Antiquity of hieroglyphical Writing; and shews that the Heathens borrowed all the Knowledge and Learning they had, from Revelation, and wilfully misapplied it. Christianity was written here in legible Characters; in such as speak to the Eyes and Senses of all Men; for Pictures speak all Languages. The Complaints against the Goodness of God for *concealing* the Knowledge of himself for Ages; and then confining it to a contemptible Corner of the Earth, are fully confuted. Christianity was the Religion of *Adam* and of the Patriarchs, and the *Law* the outward Description of it; and when Men had defaced the *original Writings*, viz. the *Pictures* and *Ceremonies*; and by the most extravagant Imaginations, had so far confounded the Truth, that it must have been entirely lost, divine Mercy interposed again, revealed

a new Species of Writing, described by *Letters*, the Types and Ceremonies that were the *Shadows* of the good Things to come. And fixed the Knowledge of the *Picture Writing*, by exhibiting in Vision to *Moses*, the *Pattern*; and setting up a new Copy in his Tabernacle. And we are assured by the Law, that tells us the *Cherubs* on the Ark were in the Cloud; and by the publick History which tells us they were in the *Chariot* *; and by *St. Paul*, who tells us they were in the Glory, by calling them the *Cherubim of Glory*, that those at *Eden* were of the same *Make* and *Use* with those on the Ark: There being no other *Cherubs of Glory*, but those which were a Compound of four in one. *Eden* exhibits the *Cherubs* in Fire; the Ark, in the Cloud or Chariot. The Vision of the *Chebar*, in the fiery Cloud. The New-Testament in the Glory. We have seen before at large, that the Fire; the Cloud; the fiery Cloud; the Chariot; and the Glory, are all different Words for the same august and magnificent Display of divine Power and Greatness. The Inference is, that all these *Cherubs* were of the same *Make* or *Form* and hieroglyphical Meaning.

Some have supposed that the *Cherubs* at *Eden* were exhibited in the Air, as in a Vision.

The

* *Lev. xvi. 2.* "I will appear in the Cloud on the Mercy-Seat." Proves they were in the Cloud; unless this means the Cloud of Incense. 1 *Chr. xxviii. 18.* "Gold for the Pattern of the Chariot of the Cherubim." Proves they were in the *Chariot*.

The Text says no such Thing. It says, God *dwelt* in them and the Fire there. They were of a standing Use; were for an Oracle; and Witnesses of the finishing Scene of the typical Service. The Blood of *Christ* in *Shadow*, was to be sprinkled *before* them; and towards Heaven, and upon the Mercy Seat; on which their Eyes were fixed. And such a standing Use, seems to leave little Dispute but that they were of a standing and fixed Form. And though the Words express, *a flaming Fire turning in upon itself*, as fully as if it were real Fire, yet it may mean only a *Representation* of it in Gold, Brass and other proper Materials; as the Serpent of Brass, is called, *a fiery Serpent*, *Numb. xxi. 8.* as if it had been a real living Serpent; and the Picture and Thing pictured, always go by the same Name. There is Reason to conclude, from the Design with which the divine Presence is said to attend the *Cherubs* and *Glory* at *Eden*, that they were of a fixed and permanent Constitution, to continue to answer their Use in the Church Service. And though neither Ark, or Tabernacle, Priest or Sacrifice, be mentioned, yet the Mention of one principal Part implies all the rest. All that was previously necessary to what was to be done before them: All necessary Appurtenances. How often does the bare Mention of the Ark imply all Appendages? Nay the *Ephod*, *Jud. viii. 27.* implies the whole *Levitical Apparatus*. And

so does a graven Image, and molten Image, chap. xvii. ver. 3 and 5. *Ephod* and *Teraphim*. ver. 30. *The graven Image. The Children of Dan set up the graven Image*, in that Expression including the whole Church Service. At *Eden* God set up the *Cherubs and the Glory*, consequently every Thing else that became necessary to the Church of God; or which was by divine Appointment in Use with them. And accordingly without any further Notice of any other religious Institution, we find Priest and Sacrifices, and other Oblations, with stated Days in use soon after; which implies a *fixed Place* for divine Worship; Altar and Tent or some Covering over it. The first Man that was born brought his Offering; as did also the second of the Firstlings of his Flock, at a *stated Time*. The latter offered *in Faith*, and consequently by Order: With a View to the Lamb of God, in whom, and in whom alone, all Faith centers. *Cain* wanting *Faith*, his Offering and Person were not accepted. This implies a known Method of Communication betwixt God and Man at that Time. *Cain* was wroth that God had Respect to his Brother, but not to him. He slays his Brother, and is driven out from the Face or Presence of God. Which necessarily implies some stated Place, and *visible* Presence of God. He could not be driven from his Presence in any other Sense. Whether *Jehovah* talked with *Cain* from the

the Cloud in Glory, or from the Mercy-Seat, yet the Presence of God he was driven from, must be some *visible* and *standing* Exhibition of it. And such too as was exhibited in the Land of *Eden*, and wanting in that to which he was banished. *Cain went out from the Presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the Land of Nod*, where that Presence was not. A Presence certainly attended all the sacred *Apparatus*. And such we shall see there was in the Cherubical Figures. And such there was occasionally *between* those Figures. And it may be disputed whether that be not the Presence meant he was deprived of, only he could have no Right to approach that Presence but as chief Priest, and excluding him from being Priest, had shut him out from that Presence without Banishment. It appears from hence, that under the Expression of *Cherubs* and *flaming Fire*, is included all that was previously necessary to the sprinkling of the Blood before them; because we find all that was previously necessary in Use with them, without any further Institution. The sacrificial Service could not be compleated, nor the Priest be consecrated, without *Cherubical* Faces to come before with Blood and Incense, as appears by the Law; and by the *Thing signified*. The Atonement not being made till *Christ* entered into the Holy Places, *not the Figures of the true*, but *into Heaven itself, to appear in the Presence of God for us*. Nor was the typical Atonement com-

compleat till the Priest had entered into the Holy Place made with Hands, the Figure of the true, and appeared before the *Cberubical Faces* with the Blood of a Victim. From hence we infer, that the *Cberubical Faces* at *Eden*, were the same as were re-instituted, with the rest of the Law, at *Sinai*. The Connection betwixt the Sacrifices and those *Faces* bespeaks this Inference. Sacrifice was for *Atonement*; and Atonement could not be made without sprinkling the Altar before the Lord, and the Mercy-Seat, with the Blood of it. The Firstlings of his Flock, and of their *Fat* which *Abel* offered to God, were not the common or daily Sacrifice, but the grand one at *the End of the Days*; and whoever reads the ninth and sixteenth of *Leviticus*, will see pretty clearly what was done with the Blood and Fat of those Firstlings; and how *Jehovah* shewed that Respect to *Abel's* Offering, which was not shewn to *Cain's*.—"The Glory of the Lord appeared—and there came out a Fire from before the Lord, and consumed upon the Altar the Burnt-Offering and the Fat." The Connection betwixt the *Mercy-Seat* and *Atonement*, was as close as betwixt Sacrifice and Atonement. When therefore we read of a divine Presence attending a *Cberubical Apparatus*, and that the *Annual* Sacrifices were in Use at the same Time, can there be any Doubt of that *Apparatus* being for the same Purpose, and consequently of the same

same Kind with that, called afterwards by the same Name, and explained at large to be set up for the Purpose of the Atonement.

The Word *Cberubim*, as I observed, is *plural*, and signifies two *distinct Figures*. I say, *Figures*, whether of Fire, as *Ezekiel's* were; or of Gold, as those on the Ark were, because *Cberubs* are not Angels, or any other Persons *themselves*, in *any one* Place of the Bible; whatever it was they represented, they were *Representatives*. This first Mention of them, informs us of their being in the Glory; *two* in Number; of their Design as Guardians of the Way of Life eternal. And the co-eval Use of Sacrifice shews us that the Atonement was made before them. And that they were a necessary Part of the *shadowy Exhibition* of the good Things to come, just before solemnly promised by Almighty God in Person, to *Adam*, and every one that would live to God. I need not repeat, but refer back for Proof that the divine Glory around these Figures, shews they were Representatives of that *Majesty*, which dwells in the Light that no Man can approach unto. And the constant Residence of *Jebo-vah* in that Glory, is a Proof that his Residence was also in the *Cberubical Figures*. God did not *place* the fiery Cloud at *Eden* without dwelling in it himself there. And therefore, his Presence must attend the *Figures* in the same Sense it did the *Cloud*. The Verbs *וַיִּשָּׁב* must extend to *both Nouns* in the same Sense

Sense, " He dwelt in the Cherubs and the flaming Fire." In whatever Sense the Verb relate to the Fire ; it must construe with the Figures in the same Sense. See Reply, Part ii. Page 254. And this is another Proof of the Designs of those Figures. Even Dr. *Sharp* himself seems to allow there was an extraordinary Presence in the Fire or Glory on other Occasions, and that such a Presence in the *Cherubs*, would be pretty good Proof of their Design.

" No doubt the Idea of such an extraordinary Presence in the *Cherubim* themselves, as is conceived for Instance, to have been in the *Burning Bush* or *Cloudy Pillar*, will sooner reconcile us to the Hypothesis of their being Similitudes of *Rubbim*, than the Idea of a divine Presence exhibited over them or between them will do." *Discourse upon Cherubim*, p. 206.

The Gentleman was not aware that the *Cherubs* were always in the *fiery Cloud*, and consequently that the same extraordinary Presence was in them which was in the Cloud.

Thus much for the *Use* and *Design* of the Cherubs at *Eden*: But of their Form or Shape, or any further Particulars, we have no Mention here. Nor have we any express mention of them again, till we come to the Re-institution of the Law, where many Particulars are laid before us, but not all that are necessary to give us a competent Idea of this curious

H

Hieroglyphic,

Hieroglyphic, that dates its *Birth* before Man's. It is from the Prophet *Ezekiel* we are informed of their Shape and Make. *Moses* informs us, that two stood upon the Ark ; were made of the same Piece of Gold, with the Mercy-Seat, were placed in the *Holy of Holies*, that their Eyes were fixed upon the Mercy-Seat. He informs us of their having Wings ; and of the Proportion of their Wings to their Bodies ; to the Length of the Ark, and Dimensions of the figurative Heaven they stood in. He tells us the Materials they were made of ; and that the sacerdotal Vestments, and other sacred Utensils of divine Service, had Cherubical Ornaments upon them, though he is wholly silent as to the Shapes of one or the other Sort. Nor does he so much as tell us whether they were of the same Figure.

We will proceed to the Texts, *Exod. xxv. 8.*

“ Thou shalt make two *Cherubs* of Gold ; of
 “ *beaten Work* shalt thou make them, in the
 “ two Ends of the Mercy-Seat——of the
 “ *Mercy-Seat* (Marg. of the Matter of the
 “ *Mercy-Seat*) shall ye make the *Cherubs*, on
 “ the two Ends thereof.”

Here we learn that they were of Gold, *beaten out* of the same undivided Piece that covered the Ark. They were made of beaten Gold, not solid : But were carved Figures of Olive-Wood, covered with Gold ; but they were made of that same Sheet of Gold that covered the

the Ark—— “*מִן הַכַּפֹּרֶת of the Matter of the*
 “*Mercy-Seat shall ye make the Cherubs on*
 “*the two Ends thereof.*” And chap. xxxvii.
 8. “*He made two Cherubs of Gold, beaten*
 “*out of one Piece, made he them——out of*
 “*the Mercy-Seat made he the Cherubs.*”
 There is a Distinction carefully pointed out,
 betwixt setting them at the two Ends of the
 Mercy-Seat; and making them *out of* the
 Mercy-Seat. Whether Dr. *Sharp* intended
 to deny this, or Mr. *H——n*’s Explication of
 this particular Discourse, p. 49, I cannot tell.
 His Words are,

“*Neither has Mr. H——n any Autho-*
 “*rity from Moses to say as he doth, that the*
 “*Mercy-Seat was of one entire Piece of Gold*
 “*with the Substance of the Cherubim, to shew*
 “*that the Basis the Rubbim stood in, or*
 “*upon, at making the Covenant was the same,*
 “*one unparted Part of their Essence, the Es-*
 “*sence of Christ.*”

I think it is agreed on all Hands, that the
 Mercy-Seat was, as our Church expresses it
 in a Note on this Text, (*Queen Elizabeth’s*
Bible) *a Figure of Christ*. The Figures then
 that were made *of the same undivided Piece of*
Gold, must be of the same undivided Nature
 with what this Piece of Gold represented.
 The Ark was his Body; and the Mercy-Seat
 upon it crowned, and which gave Virtue to
 the Blood exhibited there, must be his Divi-
 nity. And we may agree with *Momus* him-
 self,

self, that Mr. H——n, hath shewn that he could out-do the Rabbins in the Way of mystic Interpretation. And let the Doctor shew why the Inference is not just, that the golden Images did represent Persons of the same undivided Essence with that Essence it represented itself, being both of *one entire Piece*? And to return the good Gentleman his Compliment, he has shewn here, that he can out-do the very Rabbins themselves too. But when he had his Fling at *mystic Interpretation*, he forgot how great a Stress the New-Testament lays on this Sort of Evidence. Dr. Conyers M—— made Sport with *Clouds and Mysteries*; airy Castles and typical Mountains; that he might laugh us out of the Evidence of Sacrifice. He could distinguish too betwixt *Faith in the Lamb of God* and *Faith in an antient Type*. And could assure his Readers, that *he had no Doubt about the great Articles of Christianity, which are sufficiently established without enveloping plain Questions in the Darkness of the Antedeluvian Ages*, with other such Cant, usual with those who have a Design to cover. St. Paul deals largely in mystic Interpretation. He tells us the Law was a Shadow of the good Things to come, “ but that the *Body is of Christ*. That the *holiest Place of all* “ which had the golden Censure, and the “ Ark of the Covenant, overlaid round about “ with Gold, wherein was the golden Pot, “ that had the Manna, and *Aaron's Rod* that “ budded,

“ budded, and the tables of the Covenant, and
 “ over it the Cherubim of Glory overshadow-
 “ ing the Mercy-Seat—were holy Things
 “ made with Hands, *the Figures of the true.*”

And accordingly he calls *Christ the Mercy-Seat.*

“ Justified freely by his Grace, through the
 “ Redemption that is in *Jesus Christ*, whom
 “ God hath set forth to be *ἱλαστήριον the Pro-*
 “ *pitiatory* through Faith in his Blood, to
 “ declare his Righteousness for the Remission
 “ of Sins.” *Rom. iii. 25.* I shall cite one Au-

thority from a Man of Piety and Learning,
 “ *ἱλαστήριον, Placamentum, propitiatorium.*”

Heb. ix. 5. “ *Proprie notat instrumentum*
 “ *propitiationis seu placationis, ac proinde op-*
 “ *tine in Christum quadrat, per quem pater*
 “ *nobis placatus est.* *Piscat.* The Propitia-
 “ tory or Mercy-Seat which *Paul* giveth to
 “ *Christ, Rom. iii. 25.* who is the Propitiation
 “ for our Sins, 1 *Job. ii. 2.* *Leigh's Crit. Sac.*”

Whether *Mr. H*—*n* be right or wrong in
 his Inference from the Mercy-Seat, being of
 one entire Piece of Gold with the *Cherubs*,
 this is sufficient to shew, that *Dr. Sharp* over-
 shot himself in sneering at *mystic Interpreta-*
tion as Rabbinical Dotage. The whole Law
 is one entire Lesson of *mystic Instructions.*

Christ being the Mercy-Seat by the Rules
 of *mystic Interpretation*, and express Assertion
 of Scripture; and it and the *Cherubs* being
 made out of the *same entire Piece of Gold*, the
 Inference that what both represented, are of

the same Nature, and undivided Essence, may safely be left to those who believe that these *mystic Things* had a Meaning ; or were *Figures of true ones*. Analogy requires us to understand a Unity in the *Originals*, as in the *Figures*. And the Cherubs and the Mercy-Seat were so united, that the latter includes the former, many Times, without any express Mention. *Exod.* xl. 20. "He put the Mercy-Seat above upon the Ark." Without any Mention of the Cherubs, they being united with the Mercy-Seat. And ver. 34. God gave that convincing Testimony of the emblematic Divinity belonging to all these Things, "The Cloud covered the Tent of the Congregation ; and the Glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle." In a Similitude of which Glory, the Cherubs were themselves placed.

The *Mosaic* Cherubs were winged Figures, as it follows, (*Exod.* xxv.) ver. 20. "And the Cherubs shall stretch forth their Wings on high, (or above ;) covering the Mercy-Seat with their Wings ; and their Faces shall look one to another : Towards the Mercy Seat shall the Faces of the Cherubs be."

This says nothing of what Number of Faces each Cherub had, whether one or more. Only tells us the Position of the Face of the two. They were towards one another, looking upon the Mercy Seat ; as *regarding what was done there*. And what was done there, must

must be *done under their Eyes, or Approbation:*
As well as *under their Wings or Protection.*

What that was we learn, *Lev. xvi. 11. & seq.*

“ *Aaron—*shall take his Hands full of sweet
“ Incense, beaten small, and bring it within
“ the Vail, and he shall put the Incense upon
“ the Fire before the Lord, that *the Cloud of*
“ *the Incense may cover the Mercy Seat* that
“ is upon the Testimony, that he die not.”

The Cloud of the Incense was to cover the
Mercy-Seat, that it might from thence ascend
to the Faces of the Cherubs; I say, *that it*
might; because it necessarily must ascend, and
and from *thence* carry its sweet Perfume, and
fragrant Smell, up to them. “ By *Psal. cxli.*

“ 2. *Jer. xvii. 26. Rev. v. 8. and viii. 4.*

“ & *al.* it appears that the Offering of Incense
“ referred to the Office of *Christ*, exhibiting
“ his Merits as Mediator.” Mr. *H—*

vol. VI. p. 167. see also vol. VIII. p. 257. &

seq. with the Incense the High-Priest was to
take of the Blood of the Bullock that had
been burnt without the Camp, and “ sprinkle
“ it with his Finger *upon the Mercy-Seat,*
“ Eastward, and before the *Mercy-Seat.*”

Here the Blood of *Christ* is sprinkled upon the
Mercy-Seat, and consequently before the Che-
rubical Faces: So *seen* or approved of by them,
And this is what St. *Paul* says, 1 *Tim. iii. 16.*

“ God was manifest in the *Flesh*, justified by
“ the Spirit; *seen* of Angels: *i. e.* Approved
“ of by the Angels of *Jehovah—*received

“ up into Glory.” And hence arises another plain Proof of the Design of the Cherubical Figures: And whom they personated. The Incense and all their sweet Odours were for God, not *Creatures* to smell to. *Lev. xxvi. 31.* God threatens them in case of Apostacy, “ I will not smell the Savour of your sweet “ Odours.” The Propriety of the Part of the typical Service, may be seen in the Places referred to from Mr. *H——n*, and is implied in the Text from *Leviticus*, that it was to be an agreeable Scent to the Nose, and so allay or appease the Heat, which in Anger it is full of. The Blood of *Christ* was *only* to be exhibited to God. “ *Christ* is “ entered into Heaven itself, now to appear “ in the Presence of God for us, with his own “ Blood.” *Heb. ix.* Where St. *Paul* by his Skill in *mystic Interpretation*, unravels the true Design of what was done in the Holy of Holies, and shews with what View God appointed all these Figures and *figurative Service*. The last Reflection will shew us that nothing in the Holy of Holies could represent *any other* Creature than the Man *Christ Jesus*. Because the High-Priest’s entering in here, was *Christ*’s Ascension into the highest Heavens; and to the right Hand of God in *Glory inaccessible*, and “ far above *all* Principality, and Power, “ and Might, and Dominion, and *every Name “ that is named.*” And what the High-Priest did there, is what *Christ* is now a doing above.

Whereas

Whereas if the Cherubs were *Angels*, he would be so far from being exalted above them, at *his entering into the Presence of God with his own Blood*; that he would be under the Shelter of their Wings. Not exalted above them; but put under their Protection. Provided, I mean, that St. *Paul's* mystic Interpretation will hold; and these Things were Figures of the true. The Argument is short and plain. After the High-Priest had performed all he was to do, in the *Holy Place*, or Middle-Temple; he carried the Blood of the Victim and Incense into the *Holy of Holies*, or *Holy Place of the Holy Ones*, representing thereby, *Christ's* entering into Heaven, and to the Presence of God, being exalted far above all Creatures whatever; consequently the *Cherubs* under whose Wings he stood, were not *the Creatures* he was exalted above. What the High-Priest did in the Holy of Holies, was not what *Christ* did on Earth in his State of Humiliation; but what he is now a doing in his Exaltation; in his *Glory*. And the Reader will take this with him, that the High-Priest as well as the *Cherubs*, stood in the Pattern of that Glory, or Chariot, when he fumed the Incense, and sprinkled the Blood. It overshadowed him.

The Wings of the Cherubs, which formed the *Canopy*, as the *Hebrew Word* sounds, of Heaven, where the High-Priest performed this typical Service, affords another Proof of the

the Design, and helps to decypher this hieroglyphical Record. The Wings are the Wings of God, as appears by many Allusions. *Psal.* xvii. 8. " Hide me under the Shadow of thy
 " Wings. lvii. 1. Be merciful to me O God;
 " be merciful unto me, for my Soul trusteth
 " in thee; yea in the *Shadow of thy Wings*
 " will I make my Refuge." *Psal.* xci. The
 whole Psalm speaks of *Christ*. ver. 4. " He
 " shall cover thee with his Feathers: And un-
 " der his Wings shalt thou trust—With long
 " Life, will I satisfy him and shew him my
 " Salvation." There are no guardian Angels
 but *Jehovah*; nor any Protection but from
 God, " that, says the *Psalmist*, performeth
 " all Things for me." And how should the
 Wings of Angels protect our High-Priest in
 Heaven, whilst he is pleading his Merits to
 God for us, and urging in our Behalf that firm
 Faith which resisted unto Blood: That Love
 which was stronger than Death? This was
 what the High-Priest meant by carrying In-
 cense and Blood into the Holy of Holies, and
 standing under the Shadow of the Wings of
 the Cherubs, that were stretched out over the
Mercy-Seat, whence he sent up the sweet
 Odour; and were he shewed the Blood to
 them. St. Paul hath given us the *mystic Sense*
 of the Wings, being stretched out over the
Mercy-Seat. *Heb.* ix. 5. " The Cherubim
 " of Glory (over) *shadowing* the Mercy-Seat."
 It was hardly possible to mistake the Design
 of

of this Part of the Emblem, the Words being so plain, and *Wings* so natural and obvious an Emblem of Protection and Providence; and yet Dr. *Sharp* has a Citation, to bias his Reader, and direct him to understand it of *Wisdom*; *Plato's* being better Authority than *St. Paul's*, unless he could make a *Shadow* an Emblem of Light. Some People have that Command of their Faith, which Dr. *M——* recommended to all sober, sound Divines, and can believe any Thing or Nothing, as they chuse. To sum up this Head:

The Cherubs on the Mercy-Seat were two in Number, placed in Glory, at each End of the Ark one, made both of them of one *undivided Sheet* of Gold, were exactly the same in every Respect. It is expressly said, that there was no Difference in any Respect; and we must have concluded so only from there not being any Difference mentioned. The two Figures were but one Emblem; though, for the Convenience of *Representation*, exhibited double: And they were of one entire Piece of Gold with the *crowned* Covering of the Ark; being of one Nature, and undivided Essence with it. The Ark was *Christ*; therefore their Nature the same with one of the Natures in *Christ*, which the Gold stood for: But he took not on him the Nature of Angels; therefore these were not Angels. The whole Service performed here, was what *Christ* was to do on his Ascension into the highest

highest Heavens, into which no Creature but his Humanity has been admitted ; and his Atonement is a *Cover* to the Eyes of *Jehovah* only. *The Smoak of his Incense ascends up before God*, and not Angels ; they neither are *By-standers* where he fumes it, nor is it designed as an Odour of a sweet Smell to please them. I shall now proceed to

The LESSER CHERUBICAL FIGURES.

For there were *Cherubs* on the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle, and upon the Vestments of the Priest. *Exod. xxvi. 1.*

“ Thou shalt make *כשר* the Tabernacle
“ with ten Curtains of fine twined Linen,
“ and blue, and purple, and scarlet, with
“ *Cherubs of cunning Work* (Marg. the
“ Work of a cunning Workman or Em-
“ broiderer) shalt thou make them.” Ver.

31. “ Thou shalt make a *Vail* of blue,
“ and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined
“ Linen of *cunning Work*, with *Cherubs* shall
“ it be made.” There was a *Vail* also
wrought in the same Manner, and of the
same Materials, for the Entrance into the
Tabernacle, ver. 36. and chap. xxxvi. 37.
“ of Needle-Work, Marg. Embroiderer.”

And xxviii. 4. “ They shall make holy Gar-
“ ments for *Aaron* and his Sons, that they
“ may administer unto me in the Priest’s
“ Office—they shall make the *Ephod* of
“ Gold,

" Gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and
 " fine twined Linen, with *cunning Work*."

Ver. 8. " And the *curious* (Marg. em-
 " broidered) Girdle of the Ephod shall be of
 " the same, according to the Work thereof."

Ver. 15. " Thou shalt make the Breast-Plate
 " of Judgment, with *cunning Work*, after
 " the Work of the Ephod."

One would be glad to know precisely what this *cunning Work* was. The Translators seem to have understood it of Embroidery, which they put in the *Margin*, retaining the general unmeaning Term of *cunning Work* in the Text. The Word is עֲשֵׂה which, see *Calassio*, is to *impute, account, reckon to; to add to or put together, as in casting up a Sum*. This, as spoke of the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle, and Vestments that *consecrated* the Priests, which were *wove*, is *inwrought*, put in or added to the Substance of those Garments; whether the Figures were done in when the Stuff was first wove, or wrought in with a Needle afterwards; and *embroider* is a proper Translation of it. The cherubic Figures were additional Work, and wrought as Flowers and other Figures are in our rich Garments. The *Hebrew* is a general Term, but a very expressive Word, for the *Kind of Work*. עֲשֵׂה rendered *Needle-Work* and *Embroidery* also, specifies the *Manner* of working the Figures in. *Calas.* עֲשֵׂה *Acu vel textura varios colores; sicque varias figuras*

figuras & picturas in aulaa & tapetia introduxit. And the Translation, *Exod. xxxi. 4.* and *xxxv. 32.* "To *devise* cunning and curious *Works,*" is rather too general a Translation. *Cunning* and *curious* specify nothing, nor does the Word signify one or the other; and *devise* cannot be right; for they were not to *devise* any Thing. The whole was *devised* for them, and a *Pattern* shewn; but they were to *embroider* the Garments, Curtains and Vails; and *work* some cherubic Figures in: And this is well expressed by *חָשַׁב*; but the Word does not relate to thinking or *devising* what Figures to work in, nor to the *Cunningness* of the Performance; but is only the working them in; and *thinking*, or *reckoning*, is but putting Things together. I would willingly find the precise and determinate Meaning of the Words that are used to describe these *Pictures* of the true and heavenly Places, Things and Persons. *חָשַׁב* seems a very clear Term for *inserting* the Figures or working them in, whether it were done *acu vel textura*, by the Needle or Shuttle; and it and *עָבַד* are used as *equivalent*, and are explanatory of each other.

We are not told in the *Pentateuch* what *Cherubs* they were which were *inwrought* into the Cover of the *Tabernacle* and *Priest*, and which gave him the Character of *Priest*, and qualified (consecrated) him to act as such; and can only conclude from what is said

said here, that they were not Angels, but some Thing that had a common typical Relation to the High-Priest, and the Tabernacle, and its *Vails*. One Vail gave them Admittance into the Church of God, or *Body mystic of Christ*; and by what the other represented, some have already had, and others will find Admittance into Heaven itself. St. *Paul* has decyphered this Mystery, when he tells us, the Vail was the *Flesh of Christ*; and he himself, when he told us, *the Temple was his Body*. *Heb. x. 20.* "Through the Vail, that is to say, his *Flesh*." Chap. ix. 8. "The Holy-Ghost this signifying, that the Way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first Tabernacle (*Christ's mortal Body*) was yet standing — *Christ* being come an High-Priest by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with Hands, that is to say, not of this Building; neither by the Blood of Goats and Calves, but by his own Blood, he entered in once into the *holy Place*," *sc.* Holy of Holies. I hope none will cry *Cabbala* here; or sneer at *mystic Interpretation*. The Argument seems decisive: That if *Christ* had not in him the Nature of Angels, but of God; the Cherubs on the Vail, &c. were the Figures of the God-Man, and not of Angels. And when we find it explained, as it is further on, what those particular cherubic Figures were, we shall see the

the strictest Propriety in setting this hieroglyphical Mark upon them. The *Lyon-Man*, we shall find, was the *Cherub* which was inwrought into all these emblematic Parts and Things of the Tabernacle that sustained the Character of the *God-Man*. And we could not but conclude, that it must represent something in the great Proto-Type of the Holy Place and High-Priest, had not that Particular been explained to us. We must have concluded it to have been the *Arms* of the sacerdotal Office, by the emblematic Utensils that bore them.

We may observe further, that neither here, nor elsewhere, is there any Hint of these Cherubs being either *winged* or *irradiated*, as those on the Ark, and at the *Chebar* were.

The TEMPLE CHERUBS.

When the Temple was to be built, it pleased God to exhibit a new Pattern of all the sacred Utensils of divine Service. "All this," says *David* to his Son, "the Lord made me to understand in writing, by his Hand upon me, 1 Chr. xxviii. 19." One of which Particulars, is "the Chariot of the Cherubs." The Cherubs themselves are not mentioned in the Enumeration of the Particulars in the written Account which *David* had by immediate Inspiration, and gave in writing to *Solomon*. They are implied in the Chariot,

as the Mercy-Seat and Ark are, ver. 11. in the Mention of the Holy of Holies. I do not remember, that the Commentators are agreed on what this *Cbariot* was, but that the Cherubs in this Chariot were the same as those on the Ark or Mercy-Seat, and, consequently, that there was an Ark as well as Cherubs made by Solomon, is, as far as I know, generally agreed. I must refer back to what is said about the Cloud and Glory, for an Explanation of what the Chariot was; which, though only once mentioned as belonging to the *Cberubs*, is spoke of as a necessary Appendage, and well known Part of the sacred Machinery. Ver. 18. " For the " Altar of Incense, refined Gold by Weight; " and Gold for the Pattern of the *Cbariot* of " *the Cberubs*." A new Altar of Incense was made, and a new Chariot for the new *cherubic Figures*, as what they were known to be placed in. The *Targum* on 1 Kings vii. 33. calls the Chariot, *the Cbariot of Glory*; and by its Version of Ps. xviii. 11. makes *NDYI the Whirlwind*, as the Scripture does, to be the *Cbariot of God*. *Revelatus est in magnificentia sua super Cherubim velocissimis, et duxit in fortitudine, super alas NDYI turbinis*. He appeared in his Magnificence upon the swift flying Cherubs, and rid in his Strength upon the Wings of the Whirlwind. Some learned Men, as *Spencer* and *Glassius*, cited by the Doctor, p. 154. and others, have followed this antient Paraphrase. *Glassius* says,

I

says, *Equitatio super Cherubim Deo tribuitur, cum de ventis, procellis nubibus & tempestatibus sermo est, quibus hoc nomen ob vehementiam, celeritatem, & magnificos effectus, tribuitur.* God is said to ride upon the Cherubs, when speaking of the Winds, stormy Clouds and Tempests, which are called Cherubs from their Violence, Swiftmess and magnificent Actions. Whether he was fully aware what Tempest, Whirlwind or Clouds, the Scripture, and the old Paraphrase above, spoke of, does not directly appear; but God's riding on the Cherubs, is by them all understood, to be his presiding over the Powers of Heaven; riding and ruling in the Whirlwind, fiery Cloud or Storms of Heaven, as in a Chariot, as he did for forty Years together in the Wilderness.

Dr. Sharp says, *God's riding upon the Cherubs*, "is an exalted poetical Expression, in Allusion to the Chariot of the Cherubim, p. 194:" Mistaking, we see, the Chariot, the Cherubim were in on the Ark, for the Chariot of God in the Clouds of Heaven. He would do well to inform us, how God's riding on the Cherubs, is an Allusion to their riding in a Chariot? Suppose the Cherubs, God is said to ride upon, to be Angels, and that his riding upon the Backs or Heads of Angels, or, according to the Doctor's other Comment, upon their Chariot; suppose such a Representation to be neither blasphemous nor even absurd; how does it give us any Idea of the Power

Power and Magnificence of God? We know nothing of the Angels, or are they the Objects of our Senses, and the Account the Doctor gives us of them, as from the *cherubical* Representation, as having four Heads, or rather Faces only, with one Body, and sitting in a Chariot, as here, or being themselves the Chariot, as p. 285. and marching before the Ark, another Chariot of the *Cherubim*, p. 286. all this, and much more, gives us no Account, either consistent with itself, or with any Idea of Grandeur or Power, how God's riding upon the *Cherubs* should be a poetical and sublime Allusion to their Chariot. The Doctor had Reason to say, that this Matter wanted *better clearing up* than it seems to be at present. His Account is a Heap of Inconsistencies one upon the Back of another. Solomon's Cherubs, according to his Hypothesis, were formed "in a Posture or Attitude of Progression, as preceding the Ark, and making up the *Quadriga* or Chariot of the *Cherubim*, p. 285." So the Cherubs are the Chariot of the Cherubs. (Those made by Solomon were of the same Sort, and for the same Use, as those made by Moses, viz. "to overshadow the Ark.") And after making them their own Chariot, or to ride upon themselves, of one Set of Cherubs to ride upon another, he places them in the *Attitude of Progression* before the Ark, though they stood on their Feet, stretching out their

Wings over it; and yet, in the next Page, the Ark itself is their Chariot. Solomon's Cherubs he supposes to be the Chariot of Moses's; and yet they do not ride in this Chariot, but only come after upon another Chariot: Whether the Doctor knew what he meant himself, or had not forgot what he said at the Bottom of one Page, before he got to the Bottom of the next, I must leave to the Reader, after he has run over p. 285. and 286. of his *Cherubim*. The making *one Person of the Essence fly or be seen upon the Wings of another Person of the same Essence*, which is another *blasphemous Absurdity* fathered upon Mr. H——n by our candid Doctor, p. 194. will be as candidly and honestly acknowledged, I suppose, as other *impious and false Suppositions*, put upon him by his Opponents, have been. If the *Mistakes* arose only from their Prejudices; and they thought Mr. H——n had said what they charge him with, though they took it upon hear-say only; yet when their *Mistakes*, to give it that soft Name, were pointed out to them, *Time after Time*, to continue repeating the same Calumnies, instead of retracting them, is *contrary to sound Manners and common Justice*. If any Persons of Candour and Credit think this ill Language, let them tell me, what Name they will give such Behaviour.

But

But to return to the Chariot of the Cherubs, which the Reader will easily perceive, was not the *Cherubs* themselves; and that the Chariot of God, where *Cherubs* are made that Chariot, is the Heavens, the *Names*, which are likewise *Cherubs*, or *sicut Rubim*, i. e. *emblematical Names* of God. The poetical Language of Scripture in addressing *Jehovah* as riding upon these *Cherubs*, when his Power and Greatness are to be celebrated, or his Protection invoked, bespeaks its own Beauty and Sublimity; it is placing the *Powers* of Heaven, and all that is great, august and terrible in Nature, as Servants under his Feet, and ready to execute his Commands; and in an Imitation of this great Glory were the *cherubic Figures* on the Ark; and consequently they could stand for no less Persons than those of *Jehovah*, than the *Majesty on high*, with the Man who is taken into that Majesty. Here appears a Connection betwixt the *Cherubs*, the Chariot of *Jehovah* and the Chariot of the cherubical Figures. “When he went forth for the Salvation of his People; even for Salvation with his Anointed upon the Chariot of Salvation, *Hab. iii. 8, 13.*” When “he rode upon the Heavens to their Help, and in his Excellency on the Sky.” He rode upon the Cherubs; and the cherubical Figures being in a Pattern of the Chariot, bespeaks them hieroglyphically Masters of the same Power and Greatness.

The Description of *Solomon's Cherubs* opens some other Particulars, which tends to the further Illustration of this curious and interesting Subject. And how dark and obscure soever some have represented the Account of them in Scripture, and others are labouring, with all their Might, to render it; yet whoever will consider what is said about them impartially, and without Envy, Jealousy, and Animosity, will perhaps find it plainer than he thought it.

“*I Kings vi. 23.* Within the Oracle he made two Cherubs of *Olive-Tree*, each ten Cubits high; and five Cubits was the one Wing of the Cherub, and five Cubits the other Wing of the Cherub——both the Cherubs were of one Measure and one Size——and he set the *Cherubs* within the inner House; and they stretched forth the Wings of the Cherubs, so that the Wing of the one touched one Wall, and the Wing of the other Cherub touched the other Wall; and their Wings touched one another in the Midst of the House; and he overlaid the Cherubs with Gold.”

These were the same in *Design* and *Form* then, with those that *Moses* made, only a different Edition in a larger Character; and we have here the exact Proportions of the *Cherubs*, their Wings, the Mercy-Seat, and the House they stood in, to each other. Those made by *Moses* were one fourth of the

the Size of these: *Exod. xxv. 17.* "Thou shalt make a Mercy-Seat of pure Gold; "*two Cubits and an Half* shall be the Length thereof." And this regulates all the rest. The Wings were half the Length of the Mercy-Seat, and half the Height of the Cherubs; the Cherub of ten Cubits being five Cubits in its Wing; and the two inner Wings were just the Length of the Ark, and half the Length, Breadth or Height, (for it was a Cube) of the Holy of Holies.

We may observe here, that the Wings were stretched out *strait*, as those were at the *Chebar*; because they touched each other in *the Midst of the House*, which they could not otherwise have done, being both together just as long as the Ark; and these of *Solomon's* stood like *Moses's* at the two Ends of the Mercy-Seat, without which their Wings could not have reached the Walls of the Holy of Holies; these stood upon a *Mercy-Seat*, because they were made of one entire Piece of Gold with it; and a Mercy-Seat there was, because there were Directions given about the Place for it, *1 Chr. xxviii. 11.* an Ark there must be also, though not mentioned, because the Mercy-Seat was the Cover of the Ark; and the Ark and Mercy-Seat must be in the *Chariot*, because the *Cherubs* were.

They were made of the *Oil-Tree Wood*, which we render, and that seemingly with good Reason, *Olive-Tree.* Doctor *Sharp*

says, it is *improperly rendered so*; because the *Oil-Tree* is *expressly distinguished* from it *Neb. viii. 15.* but surely the *Olive* is an *Oil-Tree*, and the Principal of the Genus. The *Oil* of the *Olive* is often spoke of; and though the Word is applied to any rich, fat Juice, it must most eminently signify the Juice of the *Olive*, for which it stands so very frequently without any distinguishing Epithet: that being the *Oil-Tree* in chief; and the Order in *Nebemiah* amounts to no more, than if it had said—"Go forth and fetch Branches of the *" Olive-Tree, and the other Oil-Tree or*
" Trees." It being necessary to have Branches of all the *Oil-Trees*; but in the first Place of the *Olive*, the principal *Oil-Tree* of them all.

The Tabernacle and Temple *Cherubs* were both covered with *ductile* or *Sheet* Gold. The Inside were carved Images of the *Oil-Tree* Wood; whether the *Olive* or the *Pine* be meant is not absolutely certain, but most probably the *Olive*, because the contrary is not said; and we should not *bluntly* condemn our Translators when there appears no Reason for it. Gold is the royal Metal; and all that we need say here, is, that it is of the same Import on these Figures as in the Holy of Holies, which was covered within and without with it, implying it to be an heavenly Place; the *biggest Heavens* indeed, the Heavens of *Jehovah*; Gold being, in *mystic Interpretation*

tation, the pure Substance of Heaven, which is the highest Idea we can form of the Essence or Substance of God. What was Gold in these Cherubs made with Hands, was Fire in those exhibited in Vision to *Ezekiel*, and by the Meaning of *Seraph* in those *Isaiab* saw.

The parallel Place in *Chronicles* mentions some Particulars not taken Notice of in *Kings*, confirming the same Proportions, and Sameness of Shape and Size.

2 *Chr.* iii. 10. " And in the most holy
" House he made two Cherubs, כַּעֲשָׂה
" צִעְצְעִים; and overlaid them with Gold—
" and they stood upon their Feet, and their
" Faces were לְבֵית (Marg. toward) the
" House."

The Cherubs were carved Images of Wood covered with Gold; and this Text tells us, the Work was צִעְצְעִים: About the Meaning of which Word there is great Uncertainty among the Learned, and Variety of Sentiments *.

The

* Dr. Sharp p. 285. says, " The Word is here taken for
" a Derivation of צִעַ as שִׁעְשְׁעִים from שִׁעַ (of
" which Derivation there are many Instances to be given) and
" is supposed to denote their being in a Posture or Attitude of
" Progression, as preceding the Ark, and making up the Qua-
" driga or Chariot of the Cherubim. This is indeed a meer
" Conjecture; but it is such an one as well agrees with the
" short Account we have of these additional Cherubim in
" *Kings* and *Chronicles*, and of their Position in the most holy
" Place:" As he is pleased to say. But, by that Account,
" they were so far from being in a Posture or Attitude of Pro-
" gression, as preceding the Ark, that they are overshadowing it,
" it being placed under their Wings, 2 *Chron.* v. 8. " For
" the

The LXX. renders it *ἐκ ξύλων*, as if they mistook the *קִיץ* for *קֵץ*, which is *Wood*. The Vulgate, *Opere statuario*. Pagn. *Opere puerorum*. Queen Elizabeth's Bible, *Wrought like Children*. Our present Translation, *Image Work*, Marg. or as some think, of *moveable Work*. Mr. H—n gave a Construction of the Word correspondent to the Idea given of it, *Jer. xlviii. 12. Transmigratores, or Carriers away of Captives*. Dr. Sharp espouses *moveable Work*, as far as he pretends to favour any particular Sense; but in a Note, p. 285. bundles together all the various Constructions and discordant Senses given of the Word, and binds them together with a Wythe cut from an *Arabic Tree*; by which, *Statuary, moveable Work, Wood Work* and *Oil-Wood*, (only we don't know what *Oil-Tree* means) are all of the same Signification,

“ the Cherubims spread forth their Wings over the Place of
 “ the Ark; and the Cherubims covered the Ark and the
 “ Staves.” Instead of *preceding* the Ark, they stand over it. Nor is the Notion of *Solomon's* Cherubs being the Chariot of *Moses's* Cherubs, less wide of the Scripture Account, or less consistent with itself; because the *Chariot of the Cherubi*, 2 *Chr. xxviii. 18.* is among the Particulars given in to *Solomon* to make for the Temple. The *Chariot* was for the Cherubs that spread out their Wings and covered the Ark; and this those made by *Solomon* did do. It is hard to conceive what is meant by *Imagery* being a *Chariot*, or why this Chariot should be drawn in a *Posture and Attitude as preceding the Ark*, which is supposed, with its Cherubs upon it, to be riding in it. It is a Mistake rather than a Conjecture, that *Solomon's* Cherubs, being in a Chariot, were a Chariot marching before those made by *Moses*. The Account is short, he says; but it is full; and only wants longer Attention than this worthy Gentleman has yet given it.

tion, or comprised all of them in the original Word.

The *quadraliteral Word* doth not occur any where else in the Bible, and there is no *Hebrew* extant elsewhere ; but then *רַצַּץ* the Root does occur frequently ; and it is common in *Hebrew* to double the last Letter, and sometimes the whole Word, as is well known : By Rule, therefore, we find the Sense of the *double*, when we find the Sense of the *single Word*, and *רַצַּץ* to be the Root of our *Noun* we are enquiring into the Sense of ; the Misconstruction of which, as I apprehend, in some Places, has given Occasion to the Variety of Senses put upon the double Word in our Text ; and which one would think cannot be all right, though Dr. *Sharp* says it. I shall beg Leave to throw in my Mite among the rich Offerings of the Wealthy, and argue under the Shelter of this Rule, that, *That Sense which a Word must have in some Places, and which will hold in all, is its true Sense.* The one Sense given to our Word under *רַצַּץ* is, *Calas. stravit, substravit, stratus, substratus fuit. Inde, stratum, stragulum.* And he construes *Jer. ii. 20. Tu prostrata meretrix. A Prostitute.* The Propriety of the Epithet shews it is rightly construed. It occurs in three other Places, *Isaiab li. 14.* “ The *Captive Exile* hasteneth that he may
“ be loosed, and that he should not die in
“ the Pit.” It is evident the Context will readily admit

admit the Construction of *stratus* here. A Person stretched out on the Ground, or thrown down in the Pit of the Jail, is desirous to get up, and be released. lxiii. 1 " Who is " this that cometh from *Edom*, with dyed " Garments from *Bozrah*? this, that is glorious in his Apparel, מַלְאִכִּים in the Greatness " of his Strength?" He is introduced here as a Warrior who had conquered his Enemies and dyed his Garments with their Blood; clothed with a Vesture dipt in Blood, having trod the Wine-Press of the Wrath of almighty God. *Sterno*, is a War Term; and that Sense of the Word corresponds with the Context, and seems much more agreeable to it than *travelling* or *wandering*. The next Place before cited, is *Jer.* ii. 20. " Upon " every high Hill, and under every green " Tree, thou hast been a *Prostitute*, playing " the Harlot." The last Place is *Jer.* xlviii. 12. which comes out good Sense under the same Construction. The Comparison is from a Barrel whose *Liquor* has settled on its Lees, and requires to be drawn off. " Moab—has " settled on his Lees, and has not been " emptied from Vessel to Vessel—therefore " I will send unto him מַלְאִכִּים those that " throw down, and מַלְאִכִּים they shall throw him " down, and shall empty his Vessels, and " break their Bottles." *Wanderers* in the *Versions* is but an indifferent Word; for though an Army from another Country are from Home,

Home, they are not wandering. But if the Vessels of the People of *Moab* wanted to be overturned and emptied out, some to throw them down and empty them out, is consistent with the Context and Scope of the Comparison; and particularly so with the Meaning of the Metaphor, that God would send an Army mighty to destroy, and who should conquer, and carry them into Captivity. *Isaiah* xxxiii. 20. is made a separate Root of, the *Nun* being supposed radical. "A Tabernacle (or Tent) that shall not be taken down," struck or *thrown down*, as Tents are when Soldiers decamp; and it comes under the Sense of *sterno* so plainly, as to leave no Doubt of its Root being *רץ*. Let us now carry this Sense to the Passage under Consideration; and it will explain the Manner of the Workmanship, or Manner of covering the *Cberubs* with Gold; and it expresses it to have been by *spreading* and *laying along* the Gold close upon all Parts. The Air around us takes the very Shapes of our Bodies, in every Point, as the Face is taken in *Stoko*. The Gold was *spread upon* the Images so as to take their exact Shape and Form. The Sheet of Gold was *spread upon* every Part of the Images, being made to cover them as the Skin does the Body; not like a loose Garment, but conforming to the Images in every Point, as if it had been their outward Surface; and as there were many *Spreadings* upon

upon the many Shapings, Parts and Turns of their Bodies, the Word is very properly *doubled* and *plural*. The Gold, by this Manner of spreading it upon the Images, answered the same End as if they had been solid Gold, which would have required a vast Quantity, besides being excessively cumbersome, and almost incapable of being moved; for *Solomon's* were near eighteen Foot high. Had those of *Moses* been solid Gold, though not much above four Feet high, two of them, with the Ark, would not have been portable by Staves, as they were to be carried. This particular Manner of covering the Images *perhaps* had a *mystic Meaning*, as well as other Particulars recorded; but the Word is very expressive of the Manner of the Workmanship in covering the Figures with Gold; and as proper a Word, as the other before explained for the *inwrought* Cherubs; and about which the Learned seem to have been as uncertain as about this; and we shall meet with another or two, that are very plain, when the Words are traced to their proper Roots, and one Sense; by Grammar Rules; and not construed by *rabbinical* Errors; *Arabic* Confusion; or random Guesses, though from great Men who gave no Reasons for their Conjectures: But confessedly guessed as in the Dark.

There is another Particular mentioned in this last Text, and which throws great Light into the Darkness some Writers have cast on

this

this mysterious Picture; and which others seemed frightened at the Thought of being removed. We learn here, that each *Cherub* had more Faces than one; and it is the first Hint we have had of that Matter.—“ Their Faces “ were לְבִית *to the House;*” or outward. All the Versions agree in this Respect. And the *Vulgate* adds *exteriorem*; “ et facies eorum “ erant versæ ad *exteriorem domum.*” i. e. *Their Faces were turned to the outer House.* They were also *inward* to each other towards the Mercy-Seat, as we have seen before. But this says, they were *outward* too; or looked *to the House.* Solomon’s Cherubs were upon a Mercy-Seat, as we have seen before; being to be made out of the same Sheet of Gold with it. And as there was a general Order to set their Faces inward, and as his were to overshadow an Ark, there is no doubt but he set the Faces of his according to that Order; and in the *Manner* their’s were set which overshadowed the Ark in the Tabernacle. And therefore, putting these two Places together, we learn that the Faces of these Images looked *inward* and *outward* both; and consequently, that each Image had more Faces than one. And those which in one Cherub looked *inward*; in the other looked *outward*; and *vice versa.* That Text which only tells us they looked *inward*, doth not tell us they *did not* look *outward.* But both together assure us, that they looked inward and outward both.

We

We are told before, that the Figures were alike in every Respect. And we see the Reason. One could not have answered the Design; and set their Faces looking at the Blood on the Mercy-Seat; and at the House or Temple at the same Time.

Every Mention almost of this, as well as many other Subjects, has some Particular not expressed in any other preceding. And the Information rises upon us, as we go on. The more Passages we compare together, the more clear it is. There is no Wonder that the Faces looking inward should be mentioned in one Place, and their looking also outward in another. It may seem strange perhaps to some notwithstanding; especially to those who labour for Scruples, and are delighted with nursing them up, that it is not said in the same Place that they looked inward and outward both. We have a parallel Instance to this out of many others that might be produced, in comparing 1 *Kings* vii. 24. and 2 *Chron.* iv. 3. *Kings*, mentions two Rows of *Knops*, under the Brim of the Brazen Sea; but says nothing of the two Rows of *Bulls*. *Chron.* mentions the *Bulls*, and says nothing of the *Knops*.

We are still in the Dark as to the *Number* and *Quality* of the Faces. Only we know that there were more Faces than one to each Cherub, and that they were the same; each Cherub being alike in every other Respect also.

What

What remains then to be enquired after, is, the precise Number of Faces, and the Species. There were but two Cherubs in the *Mosaic* Holy of Holies, and they, with all their Appendages, were carried into the Holy of Holies of the Temple, and placed under the Wings of the *Cherubs* made by *Solomon*. I have endeavoured to trace the Reason of the Junction of the two cherubic Apparatus's. *Use and Intent of Prophecy*, p. 27. This is all the Account we have under the Tabernacle and Temple of the larger and standing Cherubs; but as there were some Figures bearing the same Name, *embroidered* in the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle, and in the sacerdotal Vestments; so we find there was in the *Vail* of the Temple also: The Temple was built of Stone, and wainscotted with Cedar; and its Walls and Doors, which correspond to the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle, had *Cherubs* of Gold *inlaid* upon them.

1 *Kings* vi. 29. “ And he carved קלע, all
 “ the Walls of the House round about, with
 “ carved Figures of *Cherubs* and Palm-Trees,
 “ and open Flowers, within and without. —
 “ And for the entering of the Oracle he made
 “ Doors of *Olive-Tree*—and he carved upon
 “ them Carvings of *Cherubs* and Palm-Trees,
 “ and open Flowers, and overlaid them with
 “ Gold; and spread, כסף, the Gold upon the
 “ Cherubs and upon the Palm-Trees. So
 “ also made he for the Doors of the Temple

K

“ — He

“ —He carved thereon Cherubs and Palm-
 “ Trees, and open Flowers; and covered them
 “ with Gold, מִיֶּשֶׁר עַל הַמַּחֲקָה fitted upon the
 “ carved Work. 2 Chron. iii. 14. “ He made
 “ the Vail of Blue and Purple, and Crimson
 “ and fine Linen, and wrote Cherubs thereon.”

קָלַע rendered to *carve*, is also a *Sling*; and Figures hollowed or scooped out in Wood might be so called, either because the Instrument was in Shape like a Sling; or because the *Hollows* resemble the Hollow of a Sling. These cherubic Figures were *engraved*, and the Hollows filled up with Gold, which we call *inlaying*. The Manner or Sort of Carving is further explained by הַמַּחֲקָה which is engraved Work, by cutting out the Matter, and leaving a Hollow. Juag. v. 26. We render it *smote off*. But it is plain that Jael only pierced Sisera's Head with the Nail, which made a Dent or Hollow by breaking the Temple. The Word occurs, Job. xiii. 27. “ Thou settest a Print upon the Roots of my Feet.” i. e. makest a Mark upon my Steps, as in Hunting, making a Dent or Prick where the Foot of the Creature is traced. Leigh and others construe it by *incido, exsculpo*, to cut in, knotch, engrave. And so פָּתַח, which is another Word used for this Engraving, also implies it, signifying *to open*. וִישַׁר is to *make plain*; or fill up the Hollow smooth and even again. These Cherubs, Palm-Trees and Flowers, we see then were *inlaid*; which is equivalent

equivalent to *embroidering* in Cloth. It is inserting something which did not originally belong to them; which might also have a *mystic* Import. And these Cherubs, whatever any other might, *could relate to him only*, whom the Temple and its Doors and Vail mystically pointed out; Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life; Him by whom only we can enter into the Church here, or Heaven hereafter. "I am the Door," says he himself, "by me if any Man enter he shall be saved." The Holy-Ghost this signifying, says St. Paul, "That *Jesus* was the Way into the holiest of all; the first Tabernacle being a Figure for the Time then present." *Moses* does not mention the Palm-Trees and Flowers on the hieroglyphical Parts of the Tabernacle that marked out *Christ*; nor are we told in *Kings* or *Chron.* in what Manner they and the *Cherubs* were placed together. But we are told elsewhere. The next Question is, what Flowers were these that were *inlaid* with the Palm-Trees; and which once or twice are included in the Mention of the Palm-Trees? These Flowers are no where distinguished from those the Palm-Tree bears.—"Palm-Trees and opened Flowers."—One would naturally understand it to mean *Palm-Trees in Bloom*: As if it had been said, *Palm-Trees and opened Flowers upon them*. Nothing is said to the contrary; and the Flowers are included in the Trees, ver. 32. (*1 Kings* vi.)

“ And spread the Gold upon the Cherubs,
 “ and upon the Palm-Trees.” Including the
 Flowers in the Trees.

The next Mention we meet with of Cherubs, informs us, that a *Bull* and *Lion* were so called, and that some were coupled, or *two-fold*. 1 *Kings*. vii. 29. “ And on the Borders that were between the Ledges, were “ Lions, Oxen and *Cherubs*; and upon the “ Ledges there was a Base above; and beneath the Lions and Oxen were *certain* “ Additions made of thin Work—Under the “ Laver were Under-Setters, (*Shoulders*) “ molten at the Side of every Addition. Ver. “ 31. And also upon the Mouth of it were “ Gravings. Ver. 36. On the Plates of the “ Ledges thereof, and on the Borders thereof “ he graved *Cherubs*, Lions and Palm Trees, “ according to the Proportion of every one, “ and Additions round about.”

Here are several Difficulties to be removed, which I shall attempt, lest any Enemy, like an *Indian Bush-Fighter*, should attack us *ex improviso*, from under the Shelter of them. There is a Cut in the *Vulgate*, and the same is in *Queen Elizabeth's Bible*, of the Laver, and the Frame Work to support and move it by; which whether, that or any other may exactly answer the Description, does not greatly concern our present Enquiry. The Words that relate to the Figures that were engraved here do.—

do.—“ Lions, Oxen and Cherubs, (*sc.* and
 “ other Cherubs.)—And beneath the Lions
 “ and Oxen were לִיֹּת *coupled Figures*,” and
 of the same Sort with these on the Doors and
 Walls of the Temple, being מְעֵשֶׂה מִוֶּרֶד, the
inlaid Work: In our Translation, *thin Work*.
Pagn. opere extenso. I have shewn what Sort
 of *opus extensum* it was. All agree in dedu-
 cing לִיֹּת from לִיָּה to *Couple*, or *join together*.
 Our Translators, it is plain, had fixed no cer-
 tain Meaning to the Word, by rendering it
Additions and *certain Additions*; and for
 certain, the Word doth not determine of itself,
 what *Additions* or *coupled Work* is meant.
 Here it is spoke of *cherubic Figures*, which
 are distinguished from the Lions and Bulls;
 they being also single Figures; these coupled
 or double Figures, of the *inlaid Sort*, such as
 those on the Walls and Doors of the Temple.
 There were Rows of Oxen and Lions, and be-
 tween those Rows, Rows of the coupled Cherubs;
 and just against the Under-Setters or Shoulders,
 which the Lavers rested upon, were couple Fi-
 gures also; and upon the Mouth of the Laver
 engraved Figures. And ver. 36. *On the Plates*
 יָדוֹת of the Ledges (Handle or Axles, rather)
thereof, and on the Borders thereof, be graved
Cherubs, Lions and Palm-Trees and coupled
Figures. The *Borders* are described by Coc-
 ceius and others, as Zones, Girdles, or the broad
 betwixt the four Legs of the square
 Frame of a Table. *Notat eam partem, cui*

tabula imponitur, et cui pedes adjunguntur breviter, מסורה clausura, in illis est id, quod includit orificium lateris. And the Ledges are the four Legs, or upright Standards, *Columellæ, limbi angulares erecti.* See *Cocc. at the Words.* The Bases or Frames to hold the Lavers had Borders or which were square; and the Borders were between the Ledges; and on the Borders were Lions, Oxen and Cherubs; the Lions and Oxen above, and the Cherubs or coupled Figures beneath them. These coupled Figures were inlaid; translated certain Additions of this Work. Every Base or Frame had two such or Borders, square both of them: One at the Top, the other at the Bottom; which both had an Under-Setter or Shoulder at each Corner, and a coupled Figure at each Corner just against the Shoulder. The upper Border supported the round Compass of the Mouth, in which the Laver hung, and the lower Border had the Axles in the Wheels by which it moved. The 29th Verse says, the Lions, Oxen and Cherubs, were on the Borders; the Lions and Oxen above the Cherubs or coupled Figures. And there was a coupled Figure at each Corner: For the Frames were square. Ver. 36. *On the Plates of the Ledges (Handles or Axles) be graved Cherubs, Lions and Palm-Trees, and coupled Figures—round about.* I would observe here that the *Lions, Oxen and Cherubs* in the first Part of the 29th Verse, are the

the Lions, Oxen and ליות coupled Figures in the latter Part of it. And that the *Cherubs, Lions and coupled Figures*, ver. 36. are the Lions, Oxen and coupled Figures, or Cherubs, ver. 29. It being a Recapitulation of what hieroglyphical Decorations these moving Frames were adorned with. And by this different wording of the Description we learn, that not only an Ox was called by the general Term of *Cherub*, one Word being substituted for the other; but that the double Figures were also *Cherubs*, being called so in the same Manner. Lions, Oxen and Cherubs, being equivalent to Lions, Oxen and coupled Figures in one Place; and to Cherubs, Lions and coupled Figures in another *. These are Observations that Objections have made *material*; and we shall find a Use for them by and by. We may observe further, that *Wings* were not an essential Part of the cherubic Figures; for Lions and Oxen, naturally have none, and yet these on the *Frames* are called *Cherubs*. And as it is not said they had Wings, we have no Reason to conclude they had; but the contrary, viz. that they were Lions and Oxen as to Shape, and no more;

K 4

but

* Ver. 29. Lions, Oxen and Cherubs. Lions, Oxen and coupled Figures. Ver. 36. Lions, Cherubs and coupled Figures. Only the Lions are mentioned before the Oxen, in the first Place, and after them in the latter. As they stood in Rows round; if you began with a Lion, an Ox would be last; if with an Ox, the Lion would be last.

but *Cherubs* as to the Design of placing them there.

The only remaining Expression, is, כמער ש"א ver. 36. " — He graved Cherubs, " Lions and Palm-Trees, according to the " Proportion of every one." This has been variously rendered; but none seem to have thought they understood what it meant. The LXX is not intelligible; the Vulgate a strange, loose, wide Comment; *Quasi in similitudinem hominis stantis, ut non cælata sed apposita per circuitum viderentur.* Our English, according to the Proportion of every one, if it means, as big as the Life, cannot be right, because the Size of the Frames would not admit of it. The Margin, as does Pagnine, says, according to the Nakedness of every one. What drawing a Lion, an Ox and a Tree, according to their Nakedness, means, is not clear. The Root ער, whence מער, about which the Difficulty is, is a very extensive one, and is divided in the Lexicon into several. *To pour out*, seems to be its general Idea; which in some Cases, is more properly rendered by *exerting*, as when a Person rouses himself, and *exerts* his Strength or Abilities, whether of Body or Mind. A Tree, its Virtue, Sap, Leaves and Fruit. So *Psal.* xxxvii. 35. " *Spreading himself*, or flourishing, מתערה, like a green " bay Tree." The Skin would be properly called ער, because of its constantly pouring out Steam; and, with a Mem, is a proper Word

Word for the Parts we call *Nakedness*. But as the Idea of the Word is *to pour out*, at least as that Idea predominates in all the Senses assigned it, we must see what particular Subject it is to be understood of by the Context, in order to determine what particular Species of pouring out is meant. It is the Bull, the Lion and the Palm-Tree, *שני*, each of which, is said to be pourtrayed *נמער* according to their natural Display; or in the Condition they are when they *exert* themselves. The Bull as in Rage, the Lion rampant, and the Palm-Tree in bloom, as before, with *opened Flowers* on it. It is apparent, that *נמער* is expressive of the Attitude, Posture, Situation, or some such Circumstance relative to the Bulls, Lions and Palm-Trees; but not to the *double Figures*. And in this all agree. And *pouring out* or *Exertion* seems to lead to a Circumstance that may lead on perhaps to the mystical Meaning, when the Use of these Lavers is considered.

We are got through the Account given us of the Cherubs in the Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple; and have seen that there were several Creatures single and compound, called by that Name. Two stood on the Ark, at each End of the Mercy-Seat one; made out of one undivided Sheet of Gold with it; of the same *קצב* Cut or Make, and Size; in every Respect alike, with so many Faces a Piece, that the same Faces might look *inward* and
outward

outward at the same Time; winged, standing upright, with their Wings extended, and *overshadowing* the Ark; their Eyes upon the Mercy-Seat; they were in the Chariot of Glory, the fiery Cloud or Glory of *Jehovah*. These were the Cherubs we find so often mentioned, and which *Jehovah* appeared between, and *dwelt in*, if he dwelt in the Glory.

There were Cherubs also engraved on many Parts of the Temple, and on the sacred Vessels, as there were embroidered also in the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle, in the Vail of the Temple, and in the Garments of the Priests as necessary Badges of their sacerdotal Office. We have met with many Marks of Distinction betwixt these two Sorts. All those in the outer Temple were without Wings; were not in Glory; were either a Lion, Bull or a Conjunction of two Creatures; were none of them *statuary* or erect, as those at the *Chebar* were, and those on the Ark, which stood upright upon their Feet, which neither a Lion nor Ox can do. We must find out now what the double Cherubs on the Lavers were, which have appeared to be the same Sort that were *inlaid*, which were the same with those that were *embroidered*. And if we can find what any of them were, we find what they all were. The Scriptures, prior to the Visions of *Ezekiel*, give us not, that I know of, any further Light into this Particular, than barely calling them *double ones*;
though

though their being placed on the other *Representatives* of *Christ*, plainly shews that their hieroglyphical Design looked at him. No Body has yet been mad enough to think them mere Finery, and unmeaning Gewgaws. And the Questions are what this double Cherub was, and what it meant? *Ezekiel's* Temple puts the Matter out of all reasonable Doubt; and I shall cite the Texts about it first, though his Description of the *Quadruple* Cherub, lay before it in the Way, that we may have no Doubt upon us where to look for the Exemplar, whence the Prophet knew them to be *Cherubs* also.

Ezek. xli. 18. " The Temple——was made
 " with *Cherubs* and Palm-Trees, so that a
 " Palm-Tree was between a Cherub and a
 " Cherub, and every Cherub had two Faces;
 " so that the Face of a Man was toward the
 " Palm-Tree on the one Side, and the Face
 " of a young Lion toward the Palm-Tree on
 " the other Side: Made through the House
 " all round about.——Cherubs and Palm-
 " Trees——and on the Wall of the Temple——
 " and on the Doors of the Temple *Cherubs*
 " and Palm-Trees, like as were made upon
 " the Walls."

The double Cherub we see was the Lion-Man, which were so joined together as to be called, and considered as one Figure. The preceding Scriptures said nothing about the Manner of placing these double Cherubs and the

the Palm-Trees, only that they were *together*. There was a double Cherub, and then a Palm-Tree; then another Cherub, and then another Palm-Tree, and so on. The Figures were multiplied for the Conveniency of Representation. The two Faces *had one and the same Object* still in View; though as drawn in a Plane, being inlaid, the Faces of each particular Figure turned different Ways; but still without being divided. We see that the Lion-Man is called a *Cherub* here also, as well as the Bull, and spoke of under that general Term. Not meaning by it that there was no other hieroglyphical Animal so called; but only that they were so.

This explains the Phrase, and confirms the Interpretation I have put upon לִיּוֹת coupled Figures, two joined together. And what is of more Consequence, this shews a *peculiar Union* between the Lion and Man; and puts the *Design* out of Doubt; because it *must* have the same Relation to the God-Man, which the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle; the Walls, Doors and Vail of the Temple, and the Priest, had to the double or compound Person, the *true Levi*, or coupled one. We now know distinctly what the cherubical Figures *were* and *meant*, which were upon the emblematic Parts of the Temple, that bore a figurative Relation to the Temple of the Body of *Christ*; who was one with the Father

Father or Divinity, the Fulness of which dwelt in him *.

We meet with no third Set of Cherubs in the outer or middle Temple. Those on the Curtains and Vails of the Tabernacle, and on the corresponding Parts of the Temple, and on the Priest's Vestments, were all of the double Sort, a Lion and a Man united, with a Palm Tree in Bloom between them: We meet with none but these, besides the Bulls and Lions single. Upon the brasen Sea were *Bulls*, with the Gourds of the *wild Vine*, a Plant which contains a Heat so great, that it is reckoned among the deadly Poisons, 2 K. iv. 9, And there were *Lions* and *Bulls* upon the Frames that held the Lavers where the Sacrifices were washed. There were the double *Cherubs* upon these Frames also. *Josephus*, as cited by *Cocceius* under מְכֹנֶה says, there were *Eagles* there too †: But the Text doth not authorise him in it; and there is no Reason to think, but they would have been mentioned,

* I say, *Father* or Divinity, for though there is but one Father, with Respect to the Oeconomy of the Covenant; yet each Person is by himself *Father*, as much as God and Lord, with Respect to Essence, Eternity, Priority, Power, Dignity, Creation, and Reverence, due from us.

† In Areolis & in Limbis erant Leones, Boves, (et) Cherubim, b. 2, & alię Cherubimorum Formę, nempe Aquilę, ut *Josephus* dicit; & Palmę. Erant Limites (לִיּוֹת) infra Animalia instar מוֹרֵד *Descensus*, b. 2. Gradum, 1 K vi 29. LXX. χωραι σπον καταβασως. *Josephus*, ὅρος τῆς υποβασιν κατεσκευασμενος.

tioned, had they been there, when so minute an Account is given of all other Particulars.

The Translation of מעשה כורר, which is spoke of the *double Cherubs* in the LXX. and *Josephus*, hath been mistaken by some, who have construed *opus descensus* into *opus graduum*; whereas it is inlaid Work, explained, 1 Kings vi. 32 and 35. so clearly as hardly to have been mistaken, had not Authority misguided their Eye. I need not enter minutely into the hieroglyphical Design or Propriety of placing these Animals, in the Manner they were, on the *brazen Sea* and the *Lavers*; it almost bespeaks itself, as the Design of the joint ones on the Vail, &c. doth itself.

There is no Mention of a *brazen Sea* in the Tabernacle, but a *Laver of Brass*, and his *Foot of Brass*, served for the same Uses the Sea and ten Lavers did in the Temple; Every Thing being made in a more grand Manner, in the Temple of *Solomon*, answerable to the then Grandeur of the Kingdom, and the Enlargement of the Church of God promised to the Son of *David*. The Use of the Laver of Brass in the Tabernacle was, *Exod. xxx. 19.* " For *Aaron* and his Sons, to wash their
 " Hands and Feet in when they come into
 " the Tabernacle to minister, that they die
 " not." And 2 *Chron. iv. 6.* " Ten Lavers
 " — to wash in — such Things as they
 " offered for the Burnt-Offering, they washed
 " in

" in them ; but the Sea was for the Priests
 " to wash in." The Laver was consecrated
 with Oil, as well as *Aaron* and his Sons, and
 all the other sacred Utensils, Mercy-Seat,
 Ark, &c. were, and had an hieroglyphical
 Import, as well as they. The Purity and
 perfect Innocence of *Christ*, as Priest and Sa-
 crifice, made him acceptable to God, and pro-
 cured him the Crown of Glory. He was
 made perfect through Sufferings. " I have a
 " Baptism to be baptized with," says our
 Lord, " and how am I straitened till it be
 " accomplished." A Sea was always an Em-
 blem of Trouble, and Water of the Means
 of Purity. The Sea before the Throne of
 God, *Rev. iv. 6.* is, *chap. xv. 2.* represented
 as mingled with Fire. *And, they that had*
gotten the Victory, sing the Song of Moses, the
Servant of God: As they who escaped through
 the Red Sea did in the Wilderness ; and they
 were baptized unto Moses in the Sea. *Christ*
 was both Priest and Sacrifice ; and there was a
 Baptism of his which Man could not be baptized
 with ; as there is also one that he can. " Can
 " ye drink of the Cup that I drink of ? and
 " be baptized with the Baptism that I am
 " baptized with." And yet in another Sense,
 or in a lower Degree, " Ye shall indeed drink
 " of the Cup that I drink of ; and with the
 " Baptism that I am baptized *withal* shall ye
 " be baptized." The Disciples of the true
Moses, the Servant of God, are to suffer with
 him ;

him ; to be made perfect through Sufferings ; and to keep themselves unspotted from the World. The *brazen Sea*, being a *Sea of Affliction*, had Rows of *Bulls* upon it. **בקר** is to *make Inquisition* in order to punish ; to enquire diligently, search out, or *examine*. Thence it signifies the *Morning*, and is a Name adapted to the *Bull*, as an Emblem of Wrath ; as **שקר** is to the Almond-Tree, *Jer. i. 11.* “ *Jeremiah, what seest thou ?* ” “ And I said, I see a Rod of **שקר** an Almond-Tree. Then said the Lord unto me, Thou hast well seen : For I will “ **שקר** *hasten* my Word to perform it.” “ He joineth the *Sign with the Word* for a “ more ample Confirmation ; signifying by “ the Rod of the Almond-Tree, which first “ buddeth, the *hasty* coming of the *Babylonians*.” In like Manner the Meaning of a *Bull*, as a *Cberub*, is confirmed by the Meaning of its Name, as a Verb *. Between the

* And as **בקר** expresses the Design of the Bull as an Hieroglyphic, so does **כפר**, (whence **כפיר** the *Lion*, and **כפרת** the Proprietary or Mercy-Seat are derived ;) correspond with the *Things* these Parts of the cherubic Apparatus were *Signs of*. The *Atonement* was made by the God-Man, whose *Sign* was the Face of **כפיר** a young *Lion*, and the Face of a *Man*, (or two Heads like *Janus's*) joined on one Body. *Ezek. xli. 19.* And is spoke of as *God*, under the Character of that Beast. *Amos iii. 8.* “ The Lion hath roared, who “ will not fear the Lord *Jehovah*, (not as the *Translation* “ supposeth, *the Lord the Almighty*, but) the Lord *Jehovah* hath “ spoken.” There is a natural Reason or Propriety in the Name

the Rows of Bulls, which were ten to a Cubit, were Rows of *Gourds* of the *wild Vine*, a Plant of a hot, bitter and poisonous Quality, and said, as observed before, to be *deadly Poison*, 2 *Kings* iv. 39. Such a hot fiery Plant was a proper Emblem of the Fire, and, in Conjunction with the Bulls, a proper Mark of the Design of the *brazen Sea*, and of the Baptism they were baptized with in it. As these *Gourds*, from their hot Quality, were *hieroglyphical Fire*, they were, with their

Flowers
Name of a Lion from כפר to *cover*, as there is of בקר for the Bull, and שקד for the Almond-Tree, which joining the Signs with the Words, as our Church expresses it, gives a more ample Confirmation, and illustrates their Meaning as Signs. The two Reasons against appropriating the Lion, in the cherubic Figures, to *Christ*, are quite wide of the Point. The Noun having one Letter more in it than the Verb, doth not exclude the Sense of the Verb out of the Noun: Whether as the Name of the Lion or Mercy-Seat. And the Lion being not always applied to *Christ* in Scripture, but "sometimes to Characters quite opposite to his," as *God* and other Words are, doth not prove that the Title of *Propitiator* or *Coverer* being given to the Lion in the Cherub, is not good Proof that the Emblem belongs there solely to *Christ*, who is the only Person in the ever-blessed Trinity, whom that Title can suit. He is certainly the כפיר *Coverer*, Ezek. xli. 19. And when the Doctor says, that it, a Lion, "is so far from being used as an Emblem of *Christ*, that, &c." he forgets, what he very well knew, that it is used as an Emblem of *Christ* both in *Ezekiel*, *Amos* and *Revelations*, though under other Names in two of the Places, but under that very Name in *Ezekiel*. Mr. H——'s Argument is, that as the Propitiation belongs to but one Person in the Godhead, the Title of *Propitiator* to one of the Emblems, in the cherubic Trinity, points out which Person that Emblem belongs to. The Doctor's Deductions for Mr. H—— are something different from what that great Man makes for himself.

Flowers upon them, engraven upon the Walls of the Holy of Holies, 1 *Kings* vi. 18. for Fire has the Appearance of the Glory of God; and this Place was the Heavens of *Jehovah*.

"The Cedar of the House within was carved
"with Knops (the Gourds of the wild Vine)

"and open Flowers;" *sc.* Flowers blown upon them; and so were a proper Mark of that Essence, which is shadowed out by the *pure Substance of Heaven*, or of that Glory which is like Fire in its Appearance. The brasen Sea stood upon twelve Bulls, according to the Number of the Tribes of *Israel*, (so the Altar was built of twelve Stones, for the same Reason) the Bulls looking towards the four Winds of Heavens, from which the true *Israel* is to be gathered *.

The Washing which the *Lavers* were dedicated to, had a somewhat further View, and was that Baptism which mere Man cannot go through. The Washing with Water, or the Purity that was to qualify for the fiery Trial, and enable the real Victim to undergo it, and make Atonement, answers to *washing the burnt Sacrifice* before it was fit to be burnt.

"Such

* And this may perhaps explain a Piece of History, recorded as an Impiety of *Abaz*, 2 *Kings* xvi. 17. in taking down the Sea from off the Bulls, and the Lavers from their frame Work. Among other Alterations, "*Abaz* cut off the
"Borders of the Bases; and removed the Lavers from off
"them, and took down the Sea from off the brasen Oxen
"that were under it, and put it upon a Pavement of Stone
"for the King of *Affyria*." The King of *Affyria*, no doubt, had a Reason for these Alterations, and *Abaz* must know what he meant by them.

“ Such Things as they offered for the *Burnt-
Offering* they washed in the ten Lavers,”
as before cited. *The Work of the Burnt-
Offering*, as the *Hebrew* expresses it, in the
Place just referred to, was between *the Father
and the Son*; and there would be some Pro-
priety in placing the *Bull enraged* upon the
Frames of the Lavers, if that Animal had any
hieroglyphical Relation to *Fire*, as Fire natu-
rally has to *Wrath*; and if the *Lion* had any
Relation to the royal Priest, who was the
Victim also, a *Lion rampant* or triumphant,
would be no insignificant Part of the *figurative
Work*. *Wrath* here made its Demand;
the Victim by its Purity and Innocence
made a full Atonement, and triumphed upon
it, and all turned upon the Union betwixt
the *Lion* and *Man*, whose Eyes were fixed
during this Trial upon a *Palm-Tree* in Bloom,
a Tree that bears the greatest Pressure, and
thrives the better for it, its Perfection being
owing to it; and the Derivation of its Name in
Hebrew, *תמר* from *מר*, such a Resistance,
as a bitter, violent and rebellious Spirit makes
to any Restraint, seems to express its Nature,
as a Tree, *cujus lignum nullo pondere premi aut
frangi potest*. Mar. de Calaf. which no Pres-
sure or Resistance can overcome; and which,
when exerted, in a good Cause, is a most
glorious Obstinacy.

But whatever was the Design of the hiero-
glyphical Animals and Plants upon these em-

blematic Vessels, we may observe that here are no winged Cherubs, whether single or double, nor any *treble* or *quadruple* to be met with any where, except those on the Ark were such. The *Uncertainty* of what Species those in the outer Temple were of, has been improved into an Objection against the *Sameness of Appearance* in those on the Ark, and those seen at the *Chebar*; and that Uncertainty is one of the strongest Prejudices against Mr. H——n's Comment on this Bible of *Adam*, and the other Patriarchs. Many have asserted the *Sameness* of Form in the *Mosaic Cherub*, and *Ezekiel's* in the grand Vision of the *Chebar*; others have doubted; and without considering duly and attentively the several Sorts of Cherubs, their Places, and the Descriptions we meet with of them, some Perplexity will remain; and designing Men can easily increase that Perplexity, and lead them further into the Maze who were bewildered before. Some Tempers rejoice in the Work of Confusion; the Handle will be taken out of their Hands, if no other Cherubs can be found than those already spoke of in the outer Temple. I can find no other; they may try at it; and I shall venture in the mean Time to suppose, that there are none *not described*, that can give any Ground for Doubt what those were *Ezekiel* refers to as similar to his, and which he calls by that Name, *Chron. ix. 3.* before he had so duly and maturely considered

considered that they were the *Cherubs*, as he is supposed to have done by the End of chap. x. and he does it so familiarly, as if he had known them by their hieroglyphical Title at the first Sight of them, chap. i. some Cherubs there were somewhere like these. There were none such in the outer Temple, nor any at all any where else, but what were in the Holy of Holies. Those on the Ark then must be those the Prophet refers to *; and many have concluded so, because they were called by Way of Eminence *the Cherubim*, and are so frequently spoken of under that Term at large; and this because of their Use and Importance in the Temple Service. The *inlaid* or *embroidered* ones, and which by their Situation and Form shewed their Appropriation to the Priest, and Temple on Earth, are perhaps

L 3

never

- “ Quatuor fuisse Animalia, et unum fuisse Animal. —
- “ *Ezek.* Ea bis vocat in Numero singulari, quasi unum esset
- “ Animal, dicens, *ipsum est Animal, quod videram juxta Fly-*
- “ *vium Chebar.* — *Ipsum est Animal quod vidi subter Deum*
- “ *Israel, et intellexi quia Cherubim essent.* — Secundum nu-
- “ mericam Distinctionem erant quatuor Animalia distincta, et
- “ vero secundum Figuram erant unum Animal, &c. Vi-
- “ detur *Isaias* duo tantum in illa Visione vidisse *Seraphim*,
- “ ait enim *Seraphim stabant super illud: Sex Alae uni, et sex*
- “ *Alae alteri; et rursus, clamabant alter ad alterum.* —
- “ *Stabant super illud, (Solum) habet Latina, Transl. Stabant*
- “ *in Circuitu illius, LXX. Solum porro Dei, secundum *Esai;**
- “ *et Sedes sive Thronus, secundum *Joan.* Representabat*
- “ *Arcam Dei, quae erat in Sanctuario: Quemadmodum *Ch-**
- “ *rubini, *Ezek.* et *Seraphini* *Isai.* et Animalia *Joan.* Re-*
- “ *presentabant Cherubinos qui erant in Templo circum Ar-*
- “ *cam Dei: Istos autem post fabricatum a *Solomone* Tem-*
- “ *plum, quatuor fuisse.*” —

Pererius in Apocalypsin Coloniae Agrippinae 1620, p. 842, 3.

never once alluded to in the whole Scripture or spoke of, except just in the Passage or two they are described in. They are indeed *speaking* *Indications* of the Characters belonging to the *Persons* and *Things* that were honoured with them, and could not help being seen, when their *Co-representatives* were; but still they had no peculiar Service paid them, as these Images had; I mean, not by Way of Adoration, but as they filled with their Wings the Heaven of Heavens *in Figure*; and before them was represented what the Son of God, the Seed of the Woman, or Son of a Virgin, raised from the Dead, and exalted far above every Creature, is now doing in the Presence of *Jehovah* for us. The others were *Cherubs*; these were eminently so; these were certainly of the most Note and Account. Had not *Ezekiel* meant these, when he called the *quadruple living Thing* by the Name of *Cherub* at large, without specifying what Exemplar he referred to, it is natural to think he would have said so, unless he could be supposed to design to deceive us: Besides, he has described all the other elsewhere, and these no where if not here.

But further, he could not mean the other, from the vast Number of Particulars they differed in; whereas those on the Ark are described before as corresponding with his in so many material Circumstances, except the Species of the Faces, which nothing is said about,

bout, that, that alone would justify the Conclusion of their Sameness in that Respect also. The Scripture does not indeed condescend to gratify Men in Matters of mere Curiosity ; but this was a Matter of Importance, and of the highest too. The Promises made to *Adam* concerned, and do still concern, every Son of *Adam*, and the Evidence given him, is Evidence for us. God who instituted the various Descriptions and Memorials of the good Things to come, did by that Institution *ensure* the Coming of the good Things. What the High-Priest did in the Holy of Holies, is but *in Part* compleated ; and if Actions and Pictures are to be reckoned among the intelligible Modes of Information, we may be sure these were understood, and are *still to be understood*, or *we should have heard nothing about them*. Why should God give us a blind, and imperfect Account ? It borders so near upon Blasphemy to suppose so, that I am almost afraid to put the Question, though, to shew, the Absurdity of the Supposition. Could infinite Wisdom direct its Scribes to say just enough to perplex and puzzle us, and embarrass our Thoughts about a Subject that no ways concerns us, and which we can never come at the Truth of ? *Credat judæus Apella*. We have a Description of the minuter and *significantly ornamental* Cherubs as to their animal Form in other Parts of Scripture ; but no Description as to that Point of the *Sanc-*

tum Sanctorum cherubic Figures, in any Part of Scripture, if not where the quadruple, or rather triple (two being considered as one) *living Creatures*, are described as *Cberubim*. *Ezekiel* tells us what those were in the outer Temple that were not specified before; and if those the most eminent of all are described here, then he has given us an *Account* of all that were not *specified* in the preceding Scripture. Opinions of *Men* unsupported by Argument, or mere Authority, is too treacherous and insufficient a Guide in Matters of Faith, or in Matters that lead to the Evidence of Faith. Dr. *Sharp* hath sheltered himself under several great, or supposed great, Names. I shall produce one; borrow, I mean, one from the Reverend and Learned the Provost of *Oriel*, a Gentleman whose Pen improves every Subject that comes under it, and whose great Modesty and Candour engage the Heart, though every Part perhaps of his learned and ingenious Criticisms should not entirely win the Judgment. I chuse to cite this Authority from his sprightly and animated *Strictures*; because though sufficiently clear before, the learned Author has been put to the needless Trouble of enlarging upon, and vindicating it.

“ Had the worthy Archdeacon used the
 “ same Candour in his Criticism upon the Pas-
 “ sage taken from *Irenæus*, he would have saved
 “ me the Trouble (says the truly worthy Dr.
 “ *Hodges*)

“ *Hodges*) of pointing out an Omission in
 “ him, which could not have escaped the
 “ Observation of one who sifted this Part of
 “ *Irenæus* so nicely and critically as he has
 “ done. Had every material Part relating to
 “ the sacred Emblems been produced, the
 “ Publick then might have seen that *Irenæus*
 “ had named and expressly alluded to the
 “ Figures of the *Cherubim*, as to *well known*
 “ *Emblems*.—He takes Occasion from men-
 “ tioning the Figures of the *Cherubim*, to give
 “ his Readers *the true Interpretation* of them:
 “ So that unless these Figures had been *real*
 “ *and well known* Emblems, they could not
 “ have been the Foundation of such a Super-
 “ structure. But to put this Matter out of all
 “ doubt, he sets down the *Names* and *Forms*
 “ of the Animals and then gives their Signifi-
 “ cation.——

“ *Irenæus* in this Chapter writes thus.

“ From whence it is manifest, that the
 “ *Word, Logos, Verbum*, the Artificer of all
 “ Things, who sat upon or over the *Cherubim*,
 “ and comprehends all Things, when mani-
 “ fested to Men, gave a Gospel which has an
 “ Aspect to four principal Parts or Points, con-
 “ tained in or under one Spirit.—As *David*
 “ earnestly desirous of his Advent says,—
 “ Let him appear, or may’st thou who sittest
 “ upon the *Cherubim*, appear and be manifest.
 “ For the *Cherubim* were four Persons, Faces,
 “ or (and their Faces) Representations of the
 “ Dis-

" Dispensation of the Son of God ; (i. e. figur-
 " ed forth the Transaction of the Redemption of
 " Man by Christ) for the first Animal, like
 " a Lion, signifieth the efficient Cause, as prin-
 " cipal herein, and acting a royal Part ; the
 " second, like to μοσχῶ, of the Bull or Ox
 " Kind, signifies the *sacrificial*, or the sacer-
 " dotal Character or Order ; (typically the
 " Deity, to whom alone Sacrifice appertains,
 " as it does to absolve and forgive Sin) but
 " the third Animal, having the Face of a
 " Man, manifesteth by, or in Sculpture, his
 " Advent in the Form of a Man ; the
 " fourth, like a flying Eagle, sheweth the
 " Grace of the Spirit flying to the Church ;
 " and the Gospels harmonise with these Em-
 " blems, in, or among which, Christ re-
 " sideth." *Strictures on Dr. Sharp's Cheru-*
bim, p. 15. The Greek runs thus. P. 221.

Edit Grabe. Εξ ὧν Φανερον, οτιο των απαντων τε-
 χαιτης λογῶ, ο Καθημενῶ ἐπι των Χερυβιμ, και συνε-
 χων τα παντα, Φανερωθεις τοις ανθρωποις, εδωκεν εμιν
 τετραμορφον το ευαγγελιον, εν δε πνευματι συνεχομενον.
 Καθως Δαβιδ αιτημενῶ αυτη την παρυσιαν, Φησιν.
 Ο Καθημενῶ ἐπι των Χερυβιμ, εμφανηδι. Και γαρ τα
 Χερυβιμ τετραπροσωπα και τα προσωπα αυτων εικονες
 της πραγματειας τε υιου τε Θεου. Το μεν γαρ πρωτον
 ζων, Φησι, ομοιον λεοντι. Το εμπρακτον αυτη, και
 ηγεμονικον, και βασιλικον χαραχισιζον. Το δε δευτερον
 ομοιον μοσχῶ, την Ιερουργικην και Ιερατικην ταξιν εμφανον.
 Ταδε τριτον εχον προσωπον ανθρωπου, την καλα ανθρωπον,
 αυτη παρυσιαν Φανερωτητα, Διαγραφον. Το δε τεταρτον
 ομοιον

ΟΙΟΙΟΝ ΟΕΤΩ ΠΕΤΟΜΕΝΟ, ΤΗΝ ΤΕ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΚΜΟΝΗΝ
ΕΦΙΤΑΜΕΝΟΝ ΔΟΣΙΝ ΑΠΟΡΙΣΤΟΝ.

This is a Testimony so full and strong, and as coming from one of *Irenæus's* venerable Character, *decisive* for its Authority; but take it only as *historical* and declarative of the Opinion of the primitive *Christians* about these sacred Emblems, in his Time, before the unhappy Coalition betwixt the Church of God and Synagogue of *Satan* commenced, we learn from it, that the *Cherubs* were thought to describe the Parts of each Person of the ever-blessed Trinity in the Oeconomy of the Covenant of Grace. It is a great Pleasure to find that so early a Father of the Church was an *Hutchinsonian*; though it robs Mr. *H—n* of the Honour of the *Discovery*, it does not of the *Recovery*, of this Piece of *cabalistical Duncery*; for so now is *Irenæus's Hypothesis of the Cherubim* deemed, by those who would be thought wise and good Men, for laughing at *Clouds of Allegory, mystical Interpretation and typical Mountains*.

The Truth should be confessed here, that there is *some Doubt*, whether this Account from *Irenæus* be genuine, or were foisted into the *Oxford Edition* by some wicked Hand; because Dr. *Sharp*, who hath given us "the Sum of the Evidence from *Irenæus*," can neither find any Thing to this or *any other Purpose*, after the most diligent Search, as the Reader may see, p. 288, 289, 290, 291, and

and 292. of his *Cberubim*. It is allowed, that *Irenæus* speaks of the *Cberubs* on the Ark in the Passages that are to be found in the *Durbam* Copy of that venerable Father's Works; and that he calls them τετραπροσωπα, *four-visaged*; and that their προσωπα were Images of the *Dispensation of the Son of God*; which comes so near to saying, *the Persons acting in the Dispensation of the Son of God*, that though it is not quite so explicit, yet leaves little Room to say, it is its "being
 " singled out and detached from the Con-
 " text," that makes it seem so, " greatly to
 " countenance Mr. *Hutchinson's Christian Co-*
 " *venant* in Hieroglyphicks." Had the worthy Archdeacon found the *Context* as it lays in the *Oxford* Copy, he must have spared the above Animadversion. The *Dispensation*, πραγμασια, of the *Son of God* is equivalent to our Phrase of the *Christian Covenant*, and comprehends the *Work of the Son, the Father and the holy Spirit*. In the *Context*, to what the truly worthy Provost produced in his *Elibu*, (and which is in the *Durbam* Copy) *Irenæus* gives the spiritual Sense of each separate Emblem; appropriates the Lion to the *Work* of the Son, who rules for having been the Leader and Sufferer, *efficabile ejus & principale*; the second, of the Bull Species, denoted or pointed at the *sacrificial* and sacerdotal Office; by which, an Acknowledgment was perpetually made that an Atonement was necessary, and sup-

supposes a Right in God to demand Vengeance for Sin; the third, of the Man, he confines to the Coming of *Christ* in the Flesh; and the Eagle, the fourth Emblem, he construes of the Gift of the Holy Ghost to the Church; which is making the Eagle represent the *Holy Spirit* in as full a Manner as Mr. *H*——*n* does; and the same may be said of the *Lion* and *Man* as to their Principals; and saying, that *Face* doth not stand for the *whole Person*, is a laboured Evasion, and a useless Distinction, if in *Irenæus's* Opinion, the third Emblem, having the Face of a Man, was hieroglyphical of *Christ's* taking the *whole Person* of a Man upon him or to him: And this *Irenæus* does say; and if in some Parts of this Explication he speaks in more general Terms, and is not so explicit and particular as an *Hutchinsonian* would now perhaps be, when the Meaning of that glorious Figure is debased from the divine to the Nature of Creatures, yet the A. D. is rather too peremptory when he says, "It is plain from what follows in *Irenæus*, that he expounded them in a very different Sense:" Which we will leave till it is settled what does follow in *Irenæus*. In the mean time this follows from what is cited in *Elibu*, that the *Cberubs* on the Ark were the same as to Form that *Ezekiel* saw at the *Chebar*; I mean, that it was the Opinion of this primitive Father, and consequently of the Church at that Time

Time that they were so; and that it was *the Dispensation of the Gospel*, not the Nature of Angels, or of any other Creatures which the *cherubic Emblem* was a Representation of, by its *four Visages*. He lays down this as a known and allowed Axiom for the Ground of his Comment, and Argument; and puts it upon the same Certainty as of there being *four Regions of the World, and four Winds blowing from the four Quarters*. The worthy Archdeacon was sensible of the Weight of the Testimony from the venerable Father, as is plain by his many Twistings and Struggles to get from under it. But others besides *Irenæus* have understood the sacred Emblems as explanatory or descriptive of the Performance of the Covenant of Grace. "*Rupertus arbitratur significatum esse Christum, et per quadruplicem Figuram, principalia quatuor ejus Mysteria, quæ nulli Christiano licet ignorare; per Faciem Hominis, Mysterium Incarnationis; per Similitudinem Vituli, Mysterium Passionis et Mortis; per Aquilam, Mysterium Ascensionis in Cælum; per Leonem, Mysterium Resurrectionis. Vid. Gen. 49. Andr. Cæsariensis, Leonem interpretatur Regiam Christi Dignitatem; vitulum, Sacerdotium ejus; Hominis Faciem, veram in Christo Naturam humanam Salutis nostræ Causam susceptam; Aquilam, Missionem Spiritus Sancti, &c.*" *Pererius* before cited. And

I shall proceed, upon the Authority of the Church, to consider the Description in *Ezekiel* as explanatory of the *Cberubs* in the Holy of Holies, hoping to find the *Christian Covenant* written intelligibly there, in the *hieroglyphical* Way.

The Prophet begins his Description with that of the fiery Cloud, or Chariot of Glory, the known Emblem of Divinity, and *natural* Display of Majesty and Power.

Chron. i. 4. " — Behold a Whirlwind
" came out of the North, a great Cloud, and
" Fire infolding; (*Marg. Heb. catching itself*)
" and a Brightness was about it."

This was also the Equipage or Chariot of the *Cberubs* at *Eden*; — " a flaming Fire
" rolling in upon itself;" and those on the Ark were in the Chariot of Glory.

" — And out of the Midst of it, the
" Likeness of four living Creatures. And this
" was their Appearance, *with* the Likeness of
" a Man to them — four Faces to every
" one, and four Wings to every one of them."

There was the Likeness of a Man in Glory on a Throne over their Heads. And chap. ix. 2. and x. 2. There was a Man clothed in Linen by them. The *Hebrew* only says, *this was their Appearance, the Likeness of a Man to them; and four Faces to every one;* and the Description of their Appearance continues to the End of the Chapter, when the *Likeness of a Man with them* is also particular-
ly

ly described as Part of the Vision, and included under the Phrase of *the Cherubim*. The Man in Linen is not mentioned in the first Vision as present with the Cherubim, but the Man in Glory is: He then is the Man *לְהִנָּח* *to them*, by or with them. It cannot mean that the Cherubs had a human Appearance; for except the Head of a Man, with the Lion's, and a Hand under their Wings, there was nothing human to be seen about them, their Wings covered their Bodies. —

Two Wings only are mentioned to each Cherub on the Ark; but then there is no Account taken of any to cover their Bodies; which here were two a-piece; and they with the two extended, make up the four to every one of them. — Ver. 9. “ Their Wings were joined one to another — ver. 11. and their Faces and their Wings were *פְּרֻדֹּת* *separate* upward, Marg. divided above. Two Wings of every one were joined one to another, and two covered their Bodies. — Ver. 23. Under the Firmament were their Wings strait, the one toward the other.”

Those on the Ark had their Wings stretched out strait, and two joining each other at their Extremities or Tips, and the Wings being half the Length of the Ark, and the Ark equal in Length to the Height of the Cherubs, the Wings must be stretched out strait forward, to meet in a Point over the Middle of the Mercy-Seat. These Cherubs had but

one Wing a-piece that touched each other; *Ezekiel's* had two, having none that were extended the other Way, as those on the Ark had; and in this Respect the Position of the Wings differed, according to the Nature of the Design on which they were exhibited: But both were of the winged Sort; which implies, they both represented them whose Providence rules over us.

The *Seraphim*, which *Isaiah* saw, chap. vi. had each six Wings a-piece; and the Reason is given: "With twain he covered his Face; with twain he covered his Feet; and with twain he did fly." Those whom the *Seraph* represented were now withdrawing their Favour, or *hiding their Faces* from the People.— Go and tell this People; hear ye indeed, but understand not; make the Heart of this People fat—until the Cities be wasted without Inhabitants, and the Houses without Men." God would forsake them, leaving them to the Consequence of their own Obstinacy, till the Measure of their Iniquity was full, and their Sins ripe for Judgment, when he turned his Face upon them again, or rather *against* them, in Wrath and open Vengeance. Two Wings more were necessary to mark out this Particular: Birds can let down their Wings so as to cover their Bodies and Feet at the same Time; and there required no more Wings for the *Seraph* to cover his Feet with, than the two that covered his Body. During
M their

their State of judicial Blindness, the Ways of the Lord were hidden from them; as *his Judgments* in general are *unsearchable*, and *his Way past finding out*. There is nothing said here of what Number of Faces each Seraph had; only one Wing would have covered one, or even two Faces. Each here had *two Wings* to cover his (I think we may venture to render it) Faces. The Name of Seraph evidently denotes, that they were like *Ezekiel's*, exhibited, as consisting of *Fire*, or *glorious* in their Nature. There is another Word used, Numb. xxiv. 1. for these Appearances of *Jehovah*. "*Balaam went not as at other Times לִקְרַאת נְשִׂים* to meet the Appearances in Fire;" he went at other Times to meet *Jehovah*, as chap. xxiii. 3, 15. not to meet Enchantments. Had he gone before to seek Enchantments, or play any conjuring Tricks, there would be some Room for construing his meeting the *Nabashim* so; but meeting *Jehovah*, and meeting *Nabashim*, are directly equivalent. There was a Species of Divination expressed by this Word; but here it is substituted for *Jehovah*, who had met him, in *Person* or *Persons*, visibly before; and the Reason of the Name seems plainly to be from their Appearance in Fire, like *burnished Brass*. The most material Point not explained in the Law, or elsewhere but in *Ezekiel*, is the Number and Species of the Faces, or *cherubic Animals* that composed this hieroglyphical Sub-

Deity;

Deity ; which we learn here were four in Number. And, ver. 10. " As for the Likeness of their Faces ; they four had the Face of a Man, and the Face of a Lion on the right Side ; and they four had the Face of an Ox on the left Side ; they four had also the Face of an Eagle." The Lion-Man was in each Cherub on the right Side of the Bull, and the Bull on their left, and the Eagle in the remaining third Place ; which determines the respective Situation of each to the other, considering the Lion and Man as one joint Cherub, according to its Exhibition in the outer Temple, and Condition of its Principal when come forth from the Father ; but it says nothing of the Situation of the Lion with Respect to the Man, or whether the Lion was to the Right of the Man, or the Man to the Right of the Lion : And this is the first Time the Eagle is mentioned as a cherubic Animal.

In the Re-mention of the Faces, chap. x. 14. each is by the plainest Inference *called* and *considered* as a distinct Cherub, and the Situation of the Lion to the Man determined.

" Every one had four Faces ; *the Face of one* *

M 2

" was

* The Face of one Cherub was the Face of *the* Cherub, may be objected to ; but so the Context, and the *Hebrew* requires us to read it ; and is, as if he had said, the Face of one Cherub was the Face of that commonly called so. The *Bull* having been long looked upon as the most eminent and principal Emblem in Derogation of the other two, as some in effect make it now ; which we may call the *Bull Heresy*.

“ was the Face of a Cherub ; and the Face of
 “ the second, the Face of a Man ; and the
 “ third, the Face of a Lion ; and of the
 “ fourth, the Face of an Eagle.” Not as
 translated, *the first Face was the Face of a*
Cherub ; and the second Face, the Face of
a Man, and so on. The Antecedent or
 Relative to *one, second, third and fourth*, is
cherubic or living Creature ; so that each
 Creature is called and considered as a *Cherub*,
 as well as the whole Compound, and the Crea-
 ture is considered as *one* and *four* at the same
 Time. As *Pererius*, cited above, *There were*
four Animals and one Animal, Ezekiel twice
speaks of them in the singular Number, as if
there was but one Animal—according to their
numerical Distinction they were four distinct
Animals ; but according to the Figure, they
were one Animal. This is confirmed further
 by comparing chap. i. 8. and x. 7. together,
 “ the Hands of a Man under their Wings on
 “ their four Sides.” So each single Animal
 had a Hand, and there were four Hands as
 well as four Wings to each compound Cherub.
 Chap. x. 7. “ One *Cherub* stretched forth his
 “ Hand from between the Cherubim.” So one
 Face or single Animal is here called a *Cherub*.
 We have seen before that each single Animal,
 except the Eagle, was dignified with the Title
 of *Cherub*, as being a whole representative
 Animal, who had a *Head*, as well as a *Face* ;
 though *Face* being *Person*, and the Face
 distinguishing

distinguishing one from another *, where the Body was covered, is ofteneft mentioned. Here *the four* are combined into one Body covered with Wings, and their Heads apart, *Mysterii Causa*; and as the Man and Lion are in the first Mention of them *jointly* to the Right of the Bull, so here we learn, that the Lion was to the Right of the Man; the Man being between the Bull and the Lion.

This Passage says nothing *for* or *against* any particular Union betwixt the Man and the Lion; and Dr. *Sharp* was too hasty when he said, *this second Vision exprefsly separates them*. It does not *particularly* unite them, as in chap. i. and afterwards in chap. xli. which is all that he should have infered. The Prophet begins with the Bull-Cherub, in counting the Number of Cherubim in the compound Cherub, and tells us, there were four.

The Lion-Man is so appropriated to the true *Levi*, the *double Person in the Majesty on High*, as that it admits of no Dispute, or lays the mystic Interpreters under any Difficulty, in saying, it points out *Christ*, the Mediator betwixt God and Man, who is himself both God and Man. And when we find these two or this joint one, in Conjunction with two others, placed in the emblematic Glory in the Holy of Holies, covering with their Wings

M 3 and

* Dr. *Sharp* seemingly allows the Word to be *plural*, but would evade the Inference, with Regard to the *Cherubim*; of which in its Place.

and protecting our great High-Priest in his intercessorial Office, and *regarding* the Performance, or shewing their Regard to it by fixing their Eyes on him, whilst he is presenting his Blood before them, during his Exaltation above every Creature, who can doubt but that the other two stand for Persons of equal Dignity and Glory with him, who is *only inferior to the Godhead, as touching his Manhood?* Can any one doubt, though he may ask the Question, whether the Figure of a Man represents a Man; and the Lion with him be not that other Nature which was united to Man, who is now taken up into Heaven and placed at the right Hand of the Glory above, of the Majesty on High? There is no Occasion to cite Texts to prove that *Face is Person*. Here therefore, are four Persons joined so as in some Sense to make one; and it appears that there was a peculiar Union betwixt the Lion and Man, both when exhibited in the outer Temple, as on Earth, and in the Holy of Holies, or in the highest Heavens. They are here placed on the right Side, the Bull on the Left, and the Eagle in the remaining Place. Some Persons in Heaven this Image must represent, because it was placed in the figurative or emblematical Heaven. And so says St. Paul, *Holy Places made with Hands, the Figures of the true*, Heb. ix. and chap. viii. 5. *The Priests served unto the Example and Shadow of heavenly Things*. Did they
serve

serve unto the Shadow and Example of Angels and Men? And those Persons must have a peculiar Union between themselves; and such an one as we have not the least Hint of betwixt any intelligent Creature, or any Creatures whatever.

The Heavens are indeed three Names, or Powers, they are of the same Substance; they are jointly concerned in every Action they perform; every Action they perform, being performed by the Power of the whole; and yet the immediate Agent is distinguished by Sense. We see the particular Operation of Fire, of Light, of Spirit; but not one of them can act without the joint Concurrence of the other two. So here are three Agents in the one undivided Substance of the Heavens or Expansion; but there is no Man united to them; neither could they be placed in Effigy in the Holy of Holies, which represents another World, or be supposed to see what is a doing any where, much less what is so far above them.

He who acknowledges, or has but heard of a Unity in Trinity, and the Union betwixt one Person of that Trinity and Man, must at the first Sight of that compound Figure think of that Doctrine, if not prepossessed, and misguided in his Thoughts about it; for he will not be able to adjust the compound Figure to any Opinion but of its being an Hieroglyphic of the Trinity; nor without giving this Solution

to the Appearance of a Man in the Composition. Many great Men, nay even Dr. Sharp, have tried their utmost at it, and when ye read the laboured Efforts, *risum teneatis amici?* They indeed wrote not against Conviction.—If the Wit of Men or Angels were to pretend to contrive a picturesque Description of the Christian Covenant, the Parties concerned in the Performance, and of that Performance, it seems impossible to exhibit a more striking Image, and one less liable to deceive, or lead Men into Misapprehensions of the divine Nature.

No Man in his Senses can, nor did any Man, ever take a *Beast* for more than an hieroglyphical Representative or *Substitute*, and *dwelling Place* of his God. All the World have called these particular *Animals* the *Images* of their Gods; but never took them for real Gods. The Christian could not mistake them, unless wilfully, so as to be at a Loss about the Number of Persons in the Essence; the Distinction between themselves, and from Man. He could not think them adequate *Representers* of the Persons in *Jehovah*, for nothing can be so; not Angels nor Men; and least of all the Brutes. But three Chiefs could remind him of *three Chiefs*, though the *Letters*, that were his Memorials, are no more like what they stood for than *our Letters* are now, what they stand for; the three brute Figures marked out a not to be mistaken Difference betwixt them and the Man. In

all the Appearances of *Jehovah* to his Friends, the Form was human; and to *Abraham* the three Persons came as Men, and conversed with him. That Form would not do here. Had this Figure consisted of four Men, as it must have done, it would not have distinguished one Man from the other three; and could not have expressed the Incarnation, or have distinguished which was to be incarnate. Such a Picture would have been easily perverted, and given a Handle for Disputes to have said, there were four Persons of the Essence, and thence have denied that fundamental Article of Christianity, the Incarnation, and the chief Point of our Hopes, the Glorification of Man in his own Substance and Form. Man must necessarily stand *unsymbolically* for himself, it being his very self that was to be exhibited; and God *symbolically* by something else, it not being his *very self*, that was designed or could be exhibited, but a Description only to be recorded, that was necessary to preserve the Knowledge of God and his *Christ* to *Adam* and his Posterity, whose Religion and revealed Knowledge could no more depend upon Memory only, than ours; and God had not then thought proper to reveal that Method of Writing by which he re-recorded the Law in the Wilderness. Nothing could represent a real Man, but the real Form of a Man; or that Man in the Glory of God, but a Man in a known or natural Picture of

of that Glory; nor could the personal Union of God and very Man have been distinctly represented, but by the Union of a Being of a different Nature from Man with a Man. And as the Brutes are more remote than Man from Divinity, there was the less Temptation to take them for, or worship them as God; the less Room for Ignorance or Design to mistake them as Gods, or *unfymbolical* Representations of what is God; and yet a Dignity is preserved by their being *Chiefs* themselves *. And there was still the less Danger of mistaking, because there is no such complicated Form existing in Nature. If any one would know all that can be objected to in the Propriety of the cherubic Imagery, let him read and admire at the *Discourses*, p. 125, &c. only the Author did not understand what he objected to; and indeed, most of his Objections shew he had not got a sufficiently comprehensive Idea of the Subject, or of the Force of the Evidence he undertook to examine. To say he chose to *disguise* the Evidence, would be contradicted by the many solemn Professions of his Candour and *Impartiality*; for Dr. *Sharp* is an honourable Man,

* "Cur illa quatuor Animalia haberent istas quatuor Figuras, potius quem alias?—Illa vero effigiabantur tanquam *Animalia nobilissima*, collecte, exuperanterque continentia: Illa porro quatuor Animalia in suo quodque Genere, Principatum tenent—Leo etenim Princeps Ferarum; Aquila Volucrum; Bos Armentorum, &c." *Pererius* in the Place above referred to.

Man, though a Man of like Passions with others; but how ill informed he was as to Mr. H——'s Meaning, appears from too many Instances. I have pointed out some, among others, where he assigns a Reason for there being two *Cberubs*, exactly the same, at each End of the Ark one; he throws in a Caution.

“ The Number of Potentates in the Essence
“ was not determined by the Number of
“ *Figures*, but by the *Creatures* in each,”
says Mr. H. *Gl. and Gr.* p. 131.

Is there any Thing plainer than that by *Figures* is meant the two *Cberubs*, and by *Creatures*, the Creature, in each? The Doctor mistakes this plain Sentence.

“ That is, if I take it right, says he, it is
“ not the *Number* but *Species* of the Animals
“ in each Figure or Cherub (Man excepted)
“ from whence it is collected that they are
“ Emblems of *Rubbin*.” *Discourse*, p. 123.

Mr. H——n says it is not the Number of the Figures, but the Number of the Animals in each Figure that corresponds with the Number of Persons in the Essence; the Doctor substitutes *Number of Animals in each Figure*, for *Number of Figures*, and puzzles and confounds himself and his Reader, as fully as if he had artfully designed it, which to be sure he did not; because *Number of Figures*, and *Number of Animals in each Figure*, in Mr. H——'s obscure Way of Writing, are the same Thing. And I mention

tion this here because it is as proper a Place as any to repeat that Observation of Mr. H—'s, that the *Figures* were doubled for the Convenience of Representation, in order to prevent the Objection, that if one quadruple cherubic Figure were a Picture of *the Majesty on High*, two Cherubs must suppose that there were two such *Majesties on High*. In other Words, two Gods. But the Faces could not otherwise have looked inward and outward at the same Time; or the Wings have overshadowed the Priest and Mercy-Seat whilst he made the Atonement on it, and have covered the Place beyond their immediate Presence at the same Time, without there being two Figures. It is the Number of Animals therefore in each Figure, and not the Number of Figures that related to the Number of Persons in *Jehovah*, besides the Man.

The Proofs for the mystic Design of the *Cherubim* have been fetched from the *divine Glory*, and from the Place they were set in, and from the *Mercy-Seat* they were undivided from, from the Atonement and Intercession of *Christ* represented before them, which He, our High-Priest, is now exhibiting to the Presence of God for us in the highest Heavens, in the Light which no Man can approach unto; and two of them, or one joint one, are appropriated to the holy one of God, by their Addition to so many other known and allowed

Figures of him, that the Inference is not easily to be avoided.

The Figure answers, in Point of *symbolic* Exactness, to all the great Truths of the *Christian* Covenant ; just the same Number of *Faces* to it as of Persons in the Original ; and what no Man would believe, without the strongest Evidence, and some, unhappily, not with it, a *real* Man is taken into the *divine* Glory, by a personal Union with a Lion, the known, and Naturalists say, natural and proper, Emblem of Light ; the Name the *Original* goes so often by in Scripture. The Anger of God against Sinners is appeased by the Blood and Incense, and the Acceptance of the Offering of *Christ* attested by their regarding him whilst he makes it ; the entering in of the High-Priest to their Presence, answers to the entering in of *Christ* to the real Presence ; the coming out again of the Priest to bless the People, to *Christ's* coming out again to bless his People ; the Coequality of the great ones is shewn by the Equality, as to Dignity and Præminence, of the Emblems ; their equal Share in the Glory, and their being made of the same Materials, covered with the same royal Metal, and, in Vision, having the same Appearance like that of the *burning Coals of Fire* ; Fire, the pure Substance of Heaven, most fitly representing the Essence of God, who is so often called *Heaven* ; the Wings, which three of the cherubic Animals

are

are naturally destitute of, are a plain Figure of Power and Protection ; they cover the Body of the Animals, as the Essence is not visible, nor God to be seen but in his Providence and Government over us ; and the *strait Foot* bespeaks upright and direct Proceeding ; the Species of the Foot, being that of a young Bull, has a Reference to the Wrath, if the Bull had any such Reference to Fire or Wrath ; their being full of Eyes round about, *within and without*, is a plain Indication of essential inherent Knowledge. Our Knowledge is all *ab extra*, nor is any Creature full of it. There is a Propriety, no doubt, represent what they would, in *every* Particular recorded, and a Reason, why they were made in this or that Manner, rather than another, which it would be more tedious than difficult to trace to Niceties ; but the grand Lines are discernable almost at first Sight, and the most contested Points of Scripture put out of Dispute to those who consider the hieroglyphic Scene (Persons and Actions) in the Holy of Holies, as what St. Paul says they are, *Figures of the true*. They correspond so exactly, that, without the Scripture Evidence, the Sight of the Draught of the Picture hath convinced Numbers who have but looked at it ; and it must have been described in Scripture on Purpose to deceive us, if it were not intended to point out the Unity in Trinity as the true Faith, and the Hopes of Glory,

Pardon

Pardon and Reconciliation, through the Blood of a Mediator, as the Promises of God to Man. For let any one try now to give an Account in that Way of Writing, *the only* then in Use, or pourtray in Hieroglyphicks the Creed of a *Christian*, and see, if he can express himself more fully; or let him only abstract the natural Ideas in this mixed Figure, and see, if it does not as fully express his Faith as any Words can do.

And we are not to suppose, that God left *Adam* solely to his own Fancy to construe it for himself; though had he done so, as he had himself instructed him in natural Knowledge, he could not well have mistaken the chief Points. The divine Glory around them was writing the Name of God upon them; and the Promise of the Son of God, to atone for his Sin, by his own Death, with *Sacrifice*, which was now instituted, were, and are, a sufficient Key to the whole. We have the Word of God to consult, and the Allusions to the Parts are an additional Help to us. As we think it is proved, that *Ezekiel* refers to the Cherubs on the Ark, as corresponding in Form with his, let us enumerate the Particulars common to each Figure, which he marks out to our Observation. *The Glory; four Wings; four Faces; the Order; the Lion to the right of the Man, in Junction with the Man, and to the right of the Bull; one straight Calf's Foot, sparkling like the Colour of burnished*

nished Brass; their Faces separate, and two
 Wings spread stretch'd out straight upwards, and
 two covering their Bodies like Fire, moving as
 quick as Lightning; a double Wheel that could
 move with equal Ease any Way by each of
 them; the same Spirit in the Wheels, which
 attended all their Motions as in them; the
 Noise of the Wings in Motion, as the Noise of
 many Waters; as the Voice of the almighty
 God; a Man's Hand appearing under their
 Wings; their noble Bodies, and their Backs,
 and their Hands, and their Wings, and
 Wheels full of Eyes within and without; and
 as in the Clouds of Heaven above them, sat the
 King of Glory in his Throne, as supported by
 their Wings. Add to these Particulars, that
 two of these mixed compound Figures stood on
 the Mercy-Seat, at each End one, substantially
 united to it; regarding the Priest, who
 sprinkled the Blood where they looked, and
 filled their Noses with the Fume of the Sweet
 Incense. And as the Priest appeared in Life
 here, and could not have Jehovah bodily in
 him as Christ had, Jehovah in Person stood
 upon the Mercy-Seat, in the Midst of the
 Blood and Smoke of the Incense, adding Vir-
 tue and Power to the Atonement and Inter-
 cession of his Partner, in the Work of Re-
 demption, by his personal Presence. *It must*
 The fiery Cloud or Glory, the Faces,
 Wings, Hands, Eyes and Actions, or seeming
 Actions, ascribed to them, are hardly to be
 mis-

misconstrued; and had any one been so happy as to have sketched out a Draught of the Furniture of the Holy of Holies together, that the Eye might have taken in the whole Scene at one View, the Evidence would have been too striking to have admitted of the many Scruples, Doubts, Guesses, and discordant Fancies, that continue to puzzle and perplex the Unwary, only as they come recommended under *Names* that have otherwise merited our Esteem, or are *credited* with proper additional Epithets to give them Weight.

How plainly does the Plurality of *Faces* and the Combination of the Creatures into *one glorified Body*, with their Eyes fixed on the Mercy-Seat, bespeak the Regard which the ever-blessed Trinity has to the Propitiation of *Christ*, who, as Prophet, Priest and King, appears in different Parts of the Scene * with distinguishing *Insignia*? The Prophet says, *I and the Father are one*, by the visible Union of his Face to that of the Father of Lights. *The Priest* comes with Blood and Incense, and all the *Notices* in his Dress, that could bespeak *Jehovah and Man jointly* ministering to *Jehovah*; and to add the greater Life to the Scene, *Jehovah* himself, in a Species of Presence, *assists* in the Performance, taking his Stand on the Mercy Seat in the Midst of the Blood and Incense; the Blood of the Victim *now* raised to Life again, and the Incense, the

N

ac-

* See Gl. or Gr. p. 130, & seq.

acceptable Person of him who was the sweet smelling Sacrifice to God, see *Lev. xvi.* and the King is represented as on a Throne in the Clouds of Heaven, as he is to come at the last Day with Power and great Glory : Which last Particular we have not yet inquired into.

It appears from many Parts of Scripture, that *the Glory of the Lord* was Part of the hieroglyphical Scenery in the House of God, see Mr. *H—n*, vol. vi. p. 46, & *seq.* It is of the Ark, *i. e.* of some Appendage to it, the *Psalmist* speaks, *Pf. lxxviii. 61.* “ He
“ forlook the Tabernacle of *Shilo*—and de-
“ livered his *Strength* *ny* into Captivity,
“ and his *Glory* into the Enemies Hand.” His *Strength* and his *Glory* were something visible, distinct from, and yet went with the Ark. *Pf. lxiii.* “ To see thy *Strength* and
“ thy *Glory*, so as I have seen thee in the
“ Sanctuary.” 2 *Par. vi. 41.* “ Thou and the
“ Ark of thy *Strength.*” And there is not any Thing the general Term is so applicable as to the Cloud, of which it is a very natural Epithet; and the *Strength* of the Expansion is often spoke of under this Term; and the *Glory* bespeaks itself to be the *Man in Glory.* *Isaiab* had a Vision of the King of *Glory* in the Temple.—“ I saw *Jehovah* sitting on a
“ Throne high and lifted up, and his Train
“ (who covereth himself with Light as with
“ a Garment) filled the Temple; upon it
“ (*sc.* the Throne, as some construe) stood the

“ *Se.*”

“ *Seraphim*—mine Eyes have seen the King
 “ *Jehovah* of Hosts.” *John* xii. 40. “ *Esaias*
 “ —saw his Glory, and spake of him ;” *sc.*
 of *Jesus*. *Ezekiel*, *Daniel* and *St. John*, are
 very particular in the Description of this
 Glory. *Ezek.* i. 26. “ Above the Firmament
 “ that was over their Heads, was the Like-
 “ ness of a Throne, as the Appearance of a
 “ Sapphire-Stone, and upon the Likeness of
 “ the Throne, was the Likeness as the Ap-
 “ pearance of a Man above upon it — from
 “ the Appearance of his Loins even upward,
 “ and from the Appearance of his Loins even
 “ downward, I saw as it were the *Appearance*
 “ of Fire, and it had Brightness round about.
 “ —This was the Appearance of the Like-
 “ ness of the Glory of *Jehovah*.” Is not this
 what is said, *Cant.* ii. 9. *flourishing*, מְצִיחַ
 מִן הַחֲרִיבִים out of the Burnings, *sc.* the Agents
 that burn. —“ He standeth behind our
 “ Wall.” Their hieroglyphical Paintings
 were drawn upon the Walls of their Temples
 and Palaces.—“ He looketh forth from the
 “ Windows,” against which, *Ezek.* xli. 17
 —26. “ the double Cherub was placed—מְצִיחַ
 “ *flourishing* from the Burnings, Fire or
 “ Glory.” Be that as it will : It is the
Messiah, *Jesus Jehovah* of Hosts, the King of
 Glory, whom this Part of the sacred Scenery
 exhibited. In the Vision of *Isaiab*, if עָלִי
 refer to Throne, as the antient Versions under-
 stood it, and which seems confirmed by *Rev.*

v. The cherubic Animals were upon the Throne with the King of Glory, as they are, *Rev. v.* but in *Ezekiel* they are under the Throne, as supporting it upon their Wings: And hence ariseth a further Evidence in Favour of Mr. H—n's Construction of them. Angels, or any other Creatures, can no more support the Throne of *Christ* in Heaven, than protect him there.

The Visions of *Ezekiel* represent God as pouring forth his Vengeance on the City of *Jerusalem*, and withdrawing himself from them. It is the Wrath of God, not of Angels, that is poured down upon the City; and accordingly, chap. x. 7. the Fire comes from between the Cherubs; and one Cherub takes it thence, and puts it into the Hand of the *Man clothed in Linen*, (see who he was, *Lev. xvi. 4.*) who sprinkles it over the City, to *avenge the Quarrel of the Covenant*, by the Person of him who is the *Covenant*, as we render it. *Christ*, God-Man, cannot have his Commission from Angels, or any other Creatures, who are all in Subjection under him.

Clear and strong Evidence arises from the Title given these Visions of *Ezekiel* at the Beginning; and the Design of them expressed at the End of the Description. Chap. i. 1. "The Heavens were opened, and I saw
" *Visions of God.*" Chap. x. 20. "This is
" the living Creature I saw *אנני* for, instead
of

“ of the God of Israel.” Something plausible may be urged against the Construction of *חזת* by *instead of*, because the Cherubs were *under* the Glory of God; but if the first be rightly construed, it will contribute not a little to the settling the Sense of the latter.

Visions of God must either signify *visible Representations of God*, or *Visions seen by him*. *מראה* *Vision*, is used above a hundred Times for the *Appearance* or *Aspect* of a Person or Thing; and what is more to the Point, it is frequently used for the *visible Representations* or the *Appearance* of *Jehovah* himself; for there was a *Likeness* and a *Vision* *מראה* of *Jehovah* to be seen, as *inter al.* Numb. xii. 6, 8. and chap. xxiv. 4, 16. *מחזה* a *Vision of the Almighty*, which *Balaam* saw; for the Angel of *Jehovah* appeared to him. This has been opposed by Dr. Sharp; and he appeals to Gen. xli. 2. “ *מראה* (which he writes *מראה*) of the Night.” This doth not mean, he says, an *Emblem of the Night*, but a *Night-Vision*, or *Vision seen in the Night*; neither does it mean a *Vision exhibited by the Night*, as the Agent that shewed it; which it must have done to justify the Doctor’s Construction: So neither is *Visions of the Head*, Dan. iv. 3. *Visions shewn by the Head*, but *Visions in the Head*; as *מראה עיניך* Eccles. xi. 9. is what the Eye sees itself; and 2 Chr. xxxii. 32. *Vision of Isaiah*, with many other Expressions of the same Sort, is what the

Prophet saw himself; and so *Visions of God* might be *God's Visions*, but not *Visions from him*, sent or shewn to another; and no parallel Phrase to *seeing the Visions of God*, meaning *from him*, is yet produced. *Smitten of God*, Isaiah xciii. is smitten by him; and *taught of the Lord*, is taught by him; and would still make *Visions of God* to be *Things seen by himself*, not such as another saw. A *Vision from God* is so worded, as *Lam. ii. 9.* "Her Prophets find no *Vision from the Lord.*" And *Ezek. vii. 26.* it is not said, they shall seek the Prophet's *Vision*, but "a *Vision from the Prophet.*" And I have made an unwary and hasty Concession, *Reply, p. 205.* That it might signify *Visions from God*, because I see no Authority for such Construction; Usage is entirely against it.

But the very Words, *Visions of God*, occur in two other Places, which are thought decisive. *Ezek. viii. 3.* "He put forth the Form of an Hand, and took me by a Lock of mine Head; and the Spirit lift me up between the Earth and the Heaven, and brought me בַּמְּרֹאֵת (the Doctor knows where בַּ signifies with) *in, or with the Visions of God to Jerusalem.*" Chap. xl. 2. "The Hand of the Lord was upon me, and brought me thither; in (or *with*) the Visions of God brought he me into the Land of *Israel.*" This has been supposed, for Argument Sake, not from Conviction one would

would think, to be a Rapture of his Spirit, and an *imaginary Transportation*: But why less real than the Transportation of *Elijah*, *Philip* and other Prophets, from Place to Place, in that same Cloud, or by the same Spirit? How could a *Rapture of his own Spirit*, or Heat of Imagination, *take him by the Hair of his Head*? But what will not an eager Disputant advance in the Rapture of his Spirit? The cherubic Visions went with the Prophet *Ezekiel*, and he was carried in the same Cloud or Whirlwind they were; and therefore *Visions of God*, in these two latter Places, mean the same Visions spoke of in the first; which according to the natural Acceptation of the Words, and common Usage of Scripture, imply either, that what was seen, were *Appearances or Emblems of God*, or else Appearances that God saw himself. But they are *Visions* which the Prophet saw, and consequently *of God*, in the proper Sense of the Phrase. And *Ezekiel* being in the Cloud, Fire, Light, *the usual Symbols of the divine Presence*, answers a Question started, *Disc. p. 105. How the Prophet was carried by the Spirit in an Emblem, in a Representation*; and I hope the Doctor will think himself equally concerned with me to defend the *Explanation*.

If the Cloud, Fire, Light, and the Appearance of the Likeness of the Glory of the Lord, were as is allowed, *Symbols of the divine Pre-*

sence, this will prove both, that *Visions of God* means what it says, *Emblems of God*, because he really saw such Emblems; and also, that the *Cherubic* are included in the Expression, because they were in the Cloud, Fire and Light. The same Likeness of the Glory the Man was in above, they were in below. What Words could speak plainer, or declare more strongly their being Part of *the Visions of God*, than their being so intimately connected with what is allowed to be so, and no Exception made or Warning given us to the contrary? The Fire is allowed to be Part of the Visions of God, the Animals are in the Midst of the Fire or Glory, therefore are included in the Expression, and that studied and far fetched Evasion which applies *Visions of God* to the Cloud, Fire and Light, in Exclusion of the cherubic Figures, can be but of little Service. Our Church, see Queen Elizabeth's Bible, understood the Cherubs to represent the Glory of the Lord. Note on Ezekiel, i. 7. and refers to chap. iii. 23. for Proof, *Behold the Glory of the Lord stood there as the Glory I saw by the River Chebar, and I fell down upon my Face.* Note, "Meaning the Vision of the Cherubims and the Wheels."

The Reader will judge for himself, how far it appears from other Evidence that the cherubic *Trinity in Unity* was a Figure of the true; as also how far the proper Sense of the Phrase we have been enquiring into the Meaning of, confirms

confirms that Doctrine. He who considers how often the Prophets saw the Vision or Appearance of God, and that the usual Emblems of his Presence were the Cloud and Glory, and that the Cherubs were in them, can have but little Doubt of Mr. H——'s Interpretation of Visions of God.

Something plausible at first Sight, offers itself against his Sense of תחת, which the Versions, refer to that Situation of the Cherubs *under* the Glory of the God of *Israel*: And no doubt, that Glory was above them; and it is true, that as he who is the Representative or Vicegerent of another, is *under*, or *acts under* him, *substitute* and *under* are in Hebrew, as in some other Languages expressed by the same Word. But what inclines one to understand it of *Substitution* in this Place rather than of *Situation*, is, that *the Glory of the God of Israel above them*, is not *God the Father*, as some have supposed, nor the ever blessed Trinity, but *Christ* in their Glory. And therefore if the Cherubs were not under any visible Representation of the Persons of the God of *Israel*, the Sense must be that תחת the living Creature was a *Substitute*, an emblematic Representation of the divine Persons; for I must observe that the Word for *God* is *plural*, with Respect to the Plurality of Persons in the Godhead, and is not applicable to one Person, otherwise than as a Representative like a Picture, bears the Name of its Prin-

Principal. So *Moses* is made *Aleim*, God, to *Pharaoh*, *Exod. vii. 1* which no more proves the Word to be *singular* than that *Moses* was *God*: But only that he stood in their *Stead*. It must be observed further, that it is not said, *These were the living Creatures that I saw*, חַחַח the *Glory of the God of Israel*: But, *This is the living Creature that I saw*, חַחַח the *God of Israel*. Had it meant of *Situation*, as under the *Glory*, why not say, *living Creatures under the Glory*? As to *Situation*, they were all under the *Glory*, as well as one. Why should one *Cherub* only be mentioned as *under God*, when they were all under the *Glory*, as well as one; and none of them under any visible *Representation* of more *Persons* than the *God-Man* in *Glory*; and consequently not under the *Aleim*. Now, as to *Representation*, one only was a *Substitute*; and there were *Duplicates* of the same *Representative*, as the *Nature of the Scene* required: But, in their *representative Capacity*, they were considered as one, as the two *Figures* on the *Ark* were.

And what greatly confirms the general *Interpretation* of the *cherubic Emblem*, as well as of the two last contested *Phrases*, is, that all the *World*, *Believers* and *Unbelievers* both, had *animal Substitutes* of their *Gods*. And hence possibly is *Chimera* derived; *sc.* חַיָּה the *Creature*; מַרְאֵה the *Representation*; a *Figure* not subsisting in *Nature*; and which dif-

differed in different Countries. All paid their outward Service either *to*, or *before* some cherubic Representations of one, two or more Heads. *Monfouçon* has Volumes of Proof as to the Heathen World; and Mr. *H——n* has cited so many Authorities of Figures so very similar to the original ones at *Eden*, see *Thoughts on Religion*, p. 94. that it seems to have given a learned Gentleman a Surfeit of Evidence, and left him nothing to say that will bear citing. *The prodigious Assiduity of the Collector, in picking up every little Memorial of a Bull and a Lion, or of a Cock and a Bull*, has put the learned Objector so beside himself, that he charges God, or, which is the same Thing, makes "the Hieroglyphicks chargeable with "the pernicious and fatal Consequence," or Abuse of them through the Heathen World; and seems to think, the Abuse lay in *Brute Worship*; when the Sin was setting up the *Heavens* for God, confining the Picture to *this Creature* of God, omitting the human Face, changing the *Insignia*, and, in Process of Time, the cherubic Animals, and substituting others in their Stead, as their Imaginations varied. Is God, or are the Hieroglyphicks of his Institution, chargeable with this pernicious and fatal Consequence? God forbid any *Christian* should say so. And though the Doctor doth not *intentionally* charge God himself with the Abominations of the Heathen World, he does, in Fact and Reality,

Reality, lay them at the Door of the Tabernacle. If one were to say, *the Heavens* were chargeable with the Adoration the Heathens paid them; would not this be to charge God with their Folly? The Powers of the Expansion of the Heaven, the Sun, Moon and Stars, are God's Creatures, and their Light and Glory, Power and Magnificence, are used as his Emblems or Symbols throughout the Scriptures; and the Heathen World *had such a Pleasure in their Beauty, that they thought them Gods*: Is the Sin chargeable on their Beauty? To say so, is the same Thing as to charge it on God. The Doctor says, *The Similitudes tempted Men to form the like and in their own Taste*. One might put a Quate upon that: But suppose so; is that a sufficient Reason for us to deny their divine Institution? The Serpent tempted Eve, and Eve Adam. Can we argue from thence, that God did not create either the Serpent or Eve? But the Doctor was not quite in Humour here; *he had not found the Satisfaction in Mr. H—n's Collection he hoped for*; which I verily believe; and was too eagerly pursuing a seeming Advantage against Mr. H—n (though with his usual Candour) and would fain make him do what he has done himself, charge God with the *Abuses of the Hieroglyphicks, by ascribing the Origin of them to God*. The Doctor may swell the Accusation, by making him charge
 God

God too with all the Abuses of *Letters*, because he revealed them to *Moses*, according to his Account.

The early and general Use of animal Symbols shews how deep we must search for the Rise of a Spring whose Waters have covered the whole Earth, and preserved itself even through the Confusion of the universal Deluge. *Babel*, where the first Temple was erected, on this Side the Flood, is an Evidence that Animal Worship was nearly coeval with this Earth. There were no *Heroes*, dead *Benefactors*, *Kings* and *Lawgivers*, for the Sons of Men, as yet, to celebrate as *Demi-Gods*, or worship as real ones. *Nimrod*, the first *Hero*, began this Worship; and he tells us his Design, in plain Words, that the Top of the Tower was for the Heavens; and he and his Confederates proposed to make a Name to set there, as the two *Targums*, which is early Authority, understood it; and their Actions, which are the best Comment upon People's Meaning, justify the Construction; For we learn from *Herodotus*, that its Top was actually dedicated to their God; and that there were Images in it even at his Time: One of *Jupiter Belus*. *Bel* was the Sun, and called by the *Pœnicians* and *Affyrians* the Lord of Heaven, and *Saturn*: So that the Name they proposed to make, was the ruling Name, or what they imagined the ruling Name in the Names of Heavens. See
Bochart

Bochart Canaan, lib. i. cap. 8. and Mr. H—
vol. iv. p. 17, 18. The Images were standing
there as low down as the Beginning of pro-
phane History. This is Evidence that cannot
be evaded under the Title of *heathen* and *rab-
binical*. Mountains, high Places, and the
Tops of their best Buildings are so often men-
tioned in Scripture as polluted with their
Images and filthy Rites; and all animal Re-
presentations of the Powers of the Air, whe-
ther acting in the Regions above, in the
Earth beneath, or in the Water *within* the
Earth, are so frequently condemned, that
there needs no other Proof of what their Gods
were *in Substance* and in *Shadow*, or what
they really worshipped, and under what Fi-
gures.

The Worshippers of the true God had *animal Representations* likewise which they
served. "Put away the Gods," says *Joshua*,
"your Fathers served on the other Side of
"the Flood," *i. e.* at *Haran*. Chap. xxiv.
"Terah, the Father of *Abraham*, and Father
"of *Nabor*, and they served other Gods:"
And yet *Terah* took *Abraham* from the Ido-
latry of the *Chaldees*. And it is plain, that
the true God was the Object of their Wor-
ship, by *Isaac's* sending, and *Jacob's* going
there for a Wife that was not idolatrously in-
clined like the Daughters of *Canaan*. *Laban*,
who ascribed the Blessing upon him to *Jeho-
vab*, had his sacred Imagery, his *Teraphim*,
which

which he calls *his God*; which doubtless was
 “ the God of *Abraham* and the God of *Na-*
 “ *hor*, the God of their Father,” *sc.* *Terab*,
 which is distinguished from the Fear or God
 of *Isaac*, *Gen.* xxxi. 53. *David* had the *Te-*
raphim in his House; he certainly would not
 have permitted a false God there: Nor is
 there the least Appearance of *Laban*’s ac-
 knowledging any other but *Jehovah*.

There is a Piece of History about *David*’s
Teraphim, that, if I do not give Offence in
 saying so, doth not seem to be rightly understood
 by our Translators. 1 *Sam.* xix. 13. “ *Michal*
 “ took the *Teraphim* and laid it in the Bed;
 “ and put a Pillow of Goat’s Hair for his
 “ Bolster.” *Heb.* Put a Net-Work of Goat’s
 Hair over its Heads; for כבִּיר rendered *Pil-*
low is some Sort of Net-Work, which are
 used in hot Countries to sleep under, to keep
 off troublesome Insects. *Exod.* xxvii. 4, &c.
 it is a Sieve of Net-Work; and 2 *Kings* viii.
 15. a Cloth; and such a Net or grated Can-
 vass, at some little Distance from the Face,
 would be an effectual *Blind*, and prevent the
 Face from being seen. *Michal* dressed up the
 Bed like a sick Bed; hung up the Net-Work,
 laid the Image along, and covered it with a
 Coverlid, that it might look as if there was a
 Man in it. Our Translation supposeth there
 was but *one Image* laid in the Bed; and not
 without good Reason: For why should she
 put two there? It would have defeated her
 Design.

Design. If so, *Teraphim* is only one Image; and the Word *plural*, because of *טראפֿיִם* its Heads. That the Goat's-Hair-Net was not a Pillow for a Bolster, but a *Blind* over the Heads, is plain, because the Messengers did not discern the Cheat when first sent, nor while they were bringing the Bed and *Teraphim* to *Saul*. These were their tutelar Deities; and they carried them to War with them, and on Journeys; though *Jacob* at *Bethel* set up some of the Stones of the Place for his *Penates* whilst he slept; and having a divine Dream there, he poured Oil upon them in the Morning, and consecrated them, *Gen. xxviii.* *Saul* had these *Heads* at his Head, whilst he slept, in his Pursuit after *David*, *1 Sam. xxvi.* Whatever *Saul* might, neither *Jacob* nor *David* can be supposed to have had a false God, nor an unlawful Image of the true. The Versions have given *Jacob* but a cold and hard *Pillow*, as if he had lain abroad in the open Fields, though in the City of *Luz*, without even a Knap-Sack to lay under his Head. It is an Inference, if it can be supported, of some Consequence, that *one Image* is called by a *plural* Name; as is also the other, that it had more *Heads* than one.

Micah's Teraphim were for *Jehovah*, *Jud. xvii.* and he calls them his God; they were consulted, by the Priest, in the Name of *Jehovah*, who answered him; they were set up by the Tribe of *Dan*, and continued their
God

God till the Captivity of the Land. Can it be supposed that neither *Samuel, David,* or any other of the pious Governors of *Israel* would have put an End to the solemn Service paid to the *Teraphim*, as their *Sub-Deity*, so contrary to the publick Institutions of their Church, which looked on them only as *Substitutes* of the Servants of God? Can it be supposed that *Jehovah* would stamp his divine, permissive Authority at least, upon this Innovation, had it been fundamentally wrong? The Images on the Ark are supposed to have been, according to the divine Intention, and the established Church, Angels only; or something or other we don't know what, but as far from Sub-Deities as Blasphemy is from Piety; and yet a pious Worshipper of *Jehovah*, takes it in his Head to change them into *Gods*, and consult them as such, and *Jehovah* authorises the Idolatry, and all their pious Princes connive at this Abuse of their Hieroglyphicks. And as the Cherubs were certainly set by divine Authority on the Ark, and if this or any other Abuse be *chargeable* on these Hieroglyphicks, they must be *chargeable*, as according to Dr. *Sharp*, on him whose Authority placed them there. *Micah* offended *perhaps* against the Letter of the second Commandment, in making to himself these Images; but that they were as to *Form* and *Design* the same with the authorised cherubic Figures, appears from the Face of the whole Story, and the *Teraphim* being set
O up

up for or instead of God, is full Proof that the *Cberubim* were so too.

The Images on the Ark at *Shiloh* were deemed their God by their heathen Neighbours, who must know the Sentiments of the People, when the Ark was brought into the Camp, 1 Sam. iv. " the *Philistines* said, *God is come* ; who " shall deliver us out of the Hand of *these* " *mighty Gods*." They could not be so ignorant as to call those the Images of God, which were only Statutes of Creatures standing as Servants before him ; nor can they be supposed to mean any Thing further, by saying those mighty Gods were come into the Camp, than that some *visible Representations of them*, which their Presence attended, were come into the Camp. And these Cotemporaries and near Neighbours of *Israel* in their early Days, *thought* that they had the same *representative Gods* in *Ægypt*, by adding, " these are the " Gods that smote the *Ægyptians* with all the " Plagues in the Wilderness." And this the sacred History confirms by telling us, they had a *Tabernacle* מועד, rendered of the Congregation, before that made by *Moses*. *Exod.* xxxiii. 7. his not being then made as appears by the following Chapters. See *Thoughts on Religion*, Lond. Edit. p. 76. & seq.

The Commands to destroy the Imagery of the Heathens, and the Counter-Commands of not doing so by *Jehovah*, implies that there were some Representations of God, that might be

be destroyed. “ Ye shall utterly destroy all
 “ the Places wherein the Nations that ye shall
 “ possess, served their Gods; upon the high
 “ Mountains, and upon the Hills, and under
 “ every green Tree. And you shall overthrow
 “ their Altars, and break their Pillars, and
 “ burn their Groves with Fire, and you shall
 “ hew down the graven Images of their Gods.
 “ —*Ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God.*
 “ But unto the Place which the Lord your
 “ God shall chuse to put his Name there,
 “ even unto his Habitation shalt thou seek.”
 Their Gods and their graven Images, were
 different Things. They could not destroy
 the Gods, but they could the Images, which
 they are ordered to do; but are forbid to do
 so by *the Lord their God*, i. e. not to destroy
 his Places of Worship, Pillars, Images, and
Name out of the Place he should put it in.

What has been proved by a long Induction
 of Particulars, that the hieroglyphical Descrip-
 tion of a Trinity in Unity in the Holy of Ho-
 lies, was of the ever blessed Trinity, (as its very
Form indeed speaks) might have been proved,
in short, from the second *Commandment*.

“ Thou shalt not make unto thyself any
 “ graven Image, or any Likeness of any Thing
 “ that is in Heaven above, or that is in the
 “ Earth beneath; or that is in the Water
 “ under the Earth. Thou shalt not bow
 “ down to them.”

This Precept takes in all Creatures, as well the highest Angel, as the lowest Worm. They were to make no graven Image in the Form of any Creature to represent any Power in Heaven, the Earth, or the Abyfs. The *Cherubs* were graven Images; consequently, not Images of any *created* Powers; the making such, being so solemnly forbidden. They were Images of something, not of the *Creature*, therefore, of the *Creators*. This Construction is confirmed by the Comment of the Legislator himself on it, and by the Behaviour of the Prophets. *Jehovah* set up the cherubic Images at *Eden*, and ordered a new Set of them to be made at *Horeb*. He himself ordered *the Son of Man to be lifted up in the brazen Serpent* in the Wilderness, and Incense was burnt before it, whether by divine Appointment doth not appear; but is strongly implied 2 Kings xviii. 4. "and brake in Pieces the
 "brazen Serpent that *Moses* had made: For
 "unto those Days the Children of *Israel* did
 "burn Incense unto it." They continued the divine Honours paid this Similitude of God their Saviour unto those Days, when the Reason of the Institution was ceased, and the Ceremonies degenerated into Superstition. The burning of Incense to it is no more condemned here, than the Use of it as a Sign in *Moses's* Time. The Reason of setting it up, was, the People had loathed the *Bread from Heaven*, and murmured at *Moses* because of it, and so
 were

were given up to be punished by fiery Serpents, for being deluded by him who had transformed himself into an Angel of Light ; on which, *Moses* prayed for them, and God ordered a *graven Image* of the real Angel of Light, or the true Glory, to be lifted up on a Pole, that all who looked at him, might be restored to Life. This was not, properly speaking, to *teach* them, for that they knew before, but to remind or convince them, that the Son of Man was he whom they were to look to for Salvation. God ordered the making of this graven Image, and therefore the Precept did not extend to Images of the Creators ; or to the Person of our Mediator, the God-Man, whether considered as Man or God : But to any thing else, nothing else being to be worshipped ; and therefore, not to be *represented* to the Senses for that Purpose, or in those Forms under which others did worship them.

The Prohibition at *Horeb*, and the Reason of it, *ye saw no Manner of Similitude*, could not extend to them, who did see a Similitude of *Jehovah* there, and talked to him Face to Face. Nor could there be any *Reason subsisting from the Beginning*, against exhibiting the Similitude of God, since he himself did so frequently exhibit that Similitude to his Favourites ; and never once forbids their imitating it in Materials that would preserve the Form. And we have seen that *Terah, Abraham,*

ham, Nabor, Laban, and other pious Persons
 had such Images, which are called their *Gods*;
 even whilst *Jehovah* alone was their God.
 To say *there was no Similitude of God at Horeb*
that might be represented by Art, Sculpture or
Imagery, is something that befits the Dispu-
 tant rather than the Divine to say; because
Moses and the Elders talked to God Face to
Face, Mouth to Mouth, they saw his Face
 and even to his Feet. If *no Similitude at*
Horeb be an Argument that *contravenes*, as
 Dr. *Sharp* speaks, God's ordering the *cherubic*
 Similitude of himself to be made; this will
 hold as strong against that *Likeness at the*
Chebar, which is called the *Glory of Jehovah*.
 That was a *Similitude*, which might be, and
 was *represented by Art, Sculpture and Imagery*.
 And if worshipping before the Cherubs is to
 be deemed within the Prohibition of worship-
 ping a Similitude, then *Ezekiel* was guilty of
 Idolatry, as also *Daniel, St. John*, and others,
 in worshipping the *Likeness of a Man in the*
Likeness of the Glory. And it must be a very
 nice Distinction that separates this Act of Ado-
 ration paid by *Ezekiel* to the Likeness of the
 Man, from the *Cherubs*, who were in the
 Glory as well as the Man, and were Part of
 the same Vision of God. It is too subtle for
 me. And so this Labour after Objections to
 Mr. *H———*'s *Hypothesis*, and over Dili-
 gence, in dressing them out in pompous Co-
 lours, has hurried the all-candid Objector into
 Charges

Charges against God, that border so near upon Blasphemy, that I am afraid to point them further out. He makes God to *counter-act his own Orders*, forbid their making a Similitude of any Creature, and in the same Breath, order them to make *two such Images* as contained the four principal Species in them; and set them in his own holy Place. He makes God *contravene* the very *Reason of his own Prohibition*, which is making that a Reason to the divine Wisdom To-day, which is not so To-morrow. And the Prophets and Apostles live in rank Idolatry, worshipping of Similitudes in Defiance of the divine Command. On these Accounts we may venture to say, that the worthy Doctor has some how or other mistaken the Purport and Design of the second Commandment, as also of the *no Similitude* Prohibition, *Deut. iv.* See *Reply* to the Doctor, p. 265, but more particularly the *Strictures*, p. 23. & *seq.*

I have passed over the Calf that *Aaron* made, as a corroborating Proof, that animal Representations of *Jehovah* were common in those Days, that being, though dedicated to him, an Apostacy from the *eternal Light*; "They changed their Glory into the Similitude of an Ox," by setting up only one *Cherub* as Principal, as the *Fons et Origo* perhaps of the other two Persons, they taught People to deride the inconsistent Imagination, and prepared themselves to be *reasoned* out of

a Belief in a secondary derivative God, and all the great Points that depend on each Person being *co-equal* and *co-eternal*. Though the Calf or young Bull be mentioned as the principal Figure and chief Object of Worship, yet there were more Figures or Heads than this, because the *Hebrew* Text calls them *Aleim*; and the New-Testament *Gods*, and *Works of their Hands*, Act. vii. 41.

There are other Proofs to be drawn from collateral Evidence, Inferences; and comparing the different Wording of parallel Places. Thus by comparing *Numb.* xvii. ver. 4. and 7. together, we find that the Tables of the Law *within* the Ark, and something *without*, and upon it, are both called by the common Name of *העדות*; the Face of which latter is made equivalent with the Face of *Jehovah*. "Thou shalt lay them up, *before the Testimony*, where I will meet with you." This was between the *Cherubs* on the Mercy-Seat. The Tables supposed to be the *Testimony* here spoke of, were within the Ark. The Rods were to lay till next Morning on the Mercy-Seat where *Jehovah* met *Moses*, *without* and *upon* the Ark, not within it. And as what is without Side of an Ark cannot be said to be in the *Presence* of what is within, the Word *Testimony* is to be understood of some visible permanent Emblems on the Ark, but there was nothing there but the *cherubic* Imagery; that, therefore, is called *העדות* the *Testimony*, or *Testimonies*;

monies ; or as some construe it, the *Institutions* ; but whether we render it *singular* or *plural* ; *Testimony* or *Institution*, little affects the Inferences I am laying before the Reader. It is the same Name that is given to the Epitome of the *Law*, on the two Tables within the Ark. The Church had no written *Testimonies* till *Moses* ; and the written ones were ordered to be laid up with the hieroglyphical, as having one and the same Design. And this Inference is supported by ver. 7, where “ *Moses* “ laid up the Rods *before the Lord*, in the “ *Tabernacle of Witness*.” What was *within* the Ark could not be said to be laid up in the Presence of the Lord, any more than if it had been laid up in any of their own Tents. All Things are in God’s Presence, as he sees all Things at once : But this means within Sight *visibly* and *sensibly*, *before the Testimony* and *before the Lord*, explain each other, and secures the Inference that the *Testimony* was something on the Ark, where *Jehovah* met *Moses*. And as the *Face of Jehovah* and *Face of the Testimony* are used as synonymous, both here, as also *Exod. xvi. 33, 4.* it follows, that the *Testimony* was the emblematic Presence of *Jehovah*. And a further Inference is drawn from the parallel Use of these two Phrases in *Exod.* because the Command there to lay up a Pot of *Manna before the Lord*, meaning on the Ark *before the Testimony*, was when the Ark made by *Moses* was not in being ; consequently,

quently, there was an Ark with emblematic Testimonies upon it before *Moses*. If we may conclude from the natural Face of the Words, that God ordered a Pot of *Manna* to be placed before the Lord, when the *Manna* was first given, and that *Aaron* did then place it before the Testimony, there must have been another Ark prior to that made at *Sinai*. There is a *Prolepsis* in the next Verse, where we are told, the Children of *Israel* eat *Manna* forty Years; which if it be extended to our 33d and 34th Verses, it will only follow, that the Command to lay up the *Manna* was performed when there was an Ark, which if they had none before that made by *Moses*, was not till next Year. The Book of *Numbers* was not wrote till the fortieth Year, and the Note, that they did eat *Manna* forty Years, comes in natural enough in that Place, but there is no Appearance but that this Command was given on the first Sabbath after the *Manna* was, when *Moses* having explained to them the Design of that Bread from Heaven, he continues his Discourse, at least nothing appears to the contrary, and tells them, that God had ordered an Omer of it to be laid up, for the Conviction and Instruction of future Generations. It is certain there was a Tabernacle of *מועד* or *עדת* Testimony then, because as before cited, *Moses* pitched it without the Camp, *Exod.* xxxiii. 7. before the Order for making a new one was so much as given to the People. A Tabernacle
of

of the Lord supposes some sacred Emblems in it. It could not be an empty Room. The *sacrificial Service* was certainly in full Force before its Re-Institution by *Moses*. Such *instituted Utensils* then there must be in it which Sacrifice required. That there were two Arks, as well as two Tabernacles, appears from *Numb.* ii. 17. and x. 33. "The Tabernacle of the
 " Congregation shall set forward with the
 " Camp of the Levites, *in the Midst of the*
 " *Camp*.—and the (rather an) Ark of the
 " Covenant of the Lord went before them in
 " the three Days Journey." There was an Ark to be carried in the *Midst of the Camp*, and there was also one that went three Days Journey before the Camp; and it is plain, by chap. x. 14. & *seq.* that six Tribes marched before the *Sanctuary*, in which was the Ark, (chap. iv. 5.) and consequently there were two Arks.

The *Mosaic* Tabernacle was not set up till the first Day of the second Year; and the sending out of the Spies must be in the first. "Forty Days, each Day for a Year, shall ye
 " bear their Iniquities even forty Years." *Numb.* xiv. 34. So the evil Report of the Spies, and their Defeat at *Hormah*, was before the setting up of the Tabernacle, Ark and other sacred Emblems, made by *Moses*. And yet there was an *Ark of the Covenant of the Lord* before that; for ver. 44. *It departed not out of the Camp*. If this *Murmuring* of the People happened in the first Year of the
Exodus,

Exodus, as I suppose, because the Sentence of the *forty Years wandering* in the Wilderness was pronounced at that Time, I see not how the Inference can be evaded, that there was an *Ark of the Covenant of the Lord* before that ordered at *Sinai*; and which, no Doubt, was in the *Tabernacle*, that is allowed to have been among them, before *Moses* made his: So that we have expresse Mention both of the *Tabernacle of the Lord*, and his *Ark*, before the new Copies were made in the Wilderness. And what Reason have we to think, that the *instituted Emblems*, where *Jehovah* met *Moses*, the *Tabernacle of the Testimony*, *Ark of his Covenant*, and of *Testimony*, were not of the same Use and Design with what bore the same Names afterwards? And this we think Evidence, that they had an *Ark* and *Cherubim* upon it in *Ægypt*; and that they received the new ones from *Moses*, not because they were of *Moses*, but because they were of the *Fathers*.

And we find, by the sacred History, that there were at least two publick *Arks*, confer 1 *Sam.* xiv. 18. 36. and chap. vii. 2. *Saul* had an *Ark of God* with him at *Gibeah*, while that made by *Moses* was at *Kirjathjearim*, whence *David* fetched it at the Beginning of his Reign, see *Gl.* or *Gr.* p. 148. & seq. and during this Time the *Levitical Service* went forward in *Shiloh*, which it could not do without an *Ark*. This, and a great deal more,

more, to prove that an Ark and Tabernacle were not Novelties introduced by *Moses*, was not seen by Dr. *Sharp* when he thought proper to contest this Point in his *Cberubim*.

The Reader will find many collateral Proofs in Support of *Irenæus's* Construction of the cherubical Imagery in Mr. *H——n's* *Thoughts concerning Religion*, and in that excellent Treatise, the *Elibu*, which are well worth the Perusal, besides those I have extracted and referred to in these truly valuable Writers *. I have traced the Account of the *Cberubim* through the Scriptures, and brought together the many Hints and Notices about them in the Order as they lay in the Bible, that the Reader may the easier judge of the *Origin, Figure and Design*, or Meaning of this antient hieroglyphical Record; and there remains only the proper Signification of the Word, about which, as about the other Points, much has been wrote and variously by the Learned. The curious Section of Conjectures in Dr. *Sharp's Cberubim*, upon the Derivation of the Word, will save some Trouble, the diligent Author having spared none

* If the *Christian* were to judge of the real Value of the *Elibu*, and the *Christian Plan*, and Mr. *H——n's* Writings, by the Value set upon them by that Nest of Scorpions, the *Reviewers*, he must rank them very high; for had they not been of great Worth, they could not have been so very disgusting to the Enemies of *Christ*. Dust is their Delight; and what is indifferent in itself, would be indifferent to them. This is an Excuse for their Understandings, but none for the extreme Insolence of their Language, and most shameful Misrepresentations, see also *Heathcote's Use of Reason, &c. A Word to the H——ns, &c.*

none himself, to make a full Collection of all that he owns is not worth preserving, except one favourite *Supposition*.

The Derivation of CHERUB.

We have no express Definition of the Word, or Reason assigned in Scripture, for giving this Name to the four sacred Animals, and the *Heavens*; nor is there any uncompounded Word in *Hebrew* that can give us any Light into this Matter, it only occurring as a *Name* of this Animal Imagery, and *twice* of the *Heavens*, who are also themselves Emblems, Resemblances or Enigmata * of the Lord our God, *i. e.* of *Jehovah*, our confederate Saviours. There are several Reasons that led Mr. H—n to the known and allowed Division of the Word into כ and כרוב for the Sense of it, only construing the latter Word in its *Hebrew* instead of its *Chaldee* Sense; and he makes it to be a *Resemblance of the Persons of the Majesty on high*; because the Word signifies a *Superior in Dignity, a great one*, instead of a *Resemblance of Boys*; which the treacherous Rabbins had flung out as a Blind, because one *Cberub* had a human Face. The Word is used only for the several Animals and Powers, which were Resemblances of *something*

* See that most incomparable Treatise, *Enquiry after Phil. and Theol.* in which the Mathematician, as well as the modern Divine may find a Solution of many of their Doubts. See for the Sense of *Ænigma*, p. 316 and 317.

thing great, and only for them in that Capacity, or while under that Character. Names in *Hebrew* are *expressive*, or given with Reference to some predominant Quality or remarkable Idea, which must be *common* to the different Subjects the Name is applied to; and in their *representative Capacity* this Title suits them all, but, as far as appears, in no other Respect. This however must be confessed, that, if there were any Root in which all the three Letters were radical, it would a good deal weaken, though by no Means entirely set aside, the Supposition of *ו* being a *Servile*; but we should have Reason to wonder, why so many of the Learned chose to have Recourse to such an unnecessary Division of the Word, instead of producing its Root, and proving its Meaning in a legitimate Way. The famous *Section of Conjectures* would willingly find out one entire Root, in order to set aside Mr. H——n's Etymology; and it pretends to have done so; and that it signifies *plowing, engraving, cutting*, or something of that Nature. See Dr. Sharp, p. 404. The Proof is, saying it was "*most probably once a Root in Hebrew, as it is yet in the Syriac*" —whence the *Participle passive* is regularly "*כרוב a Piece of Sculpture.*" The *most probably once in Hebrew* depends, we see, upon its being *supposed* to be so in *Syriac* and *Arabic* at present; and this again, upon what is at present called *Syriac*, being the antient
Syriac

Syriac coeval with the *Hebrew*; and that what they say sounds in *Arabic* like the Sound they give the *Hebrew* Word, is that *Hebrew* Word; and after they have arbitrarily chosen, out of a Number of similar Sounds, which they please, and, out of the Number of different and contrary Senses affixed to such a Word, which they please also, they then put that upon us for the true *prophetic* Sense of the *Hebrew* Word; but neither Dr. *Sharp* nor the Arabi-Maniack he had his Information from, can prove there ever was a כ, ק or ב in *Syriac*, or what Character the *Syrians* did use, and they will be more troubled than they seem to think of, to prove the *Identity* which is necessary in this Case; and perhaps that is the Reason they have never attempted it, though so often called upon. Dr. *Sharp* backs his *Arabic* Etymology, with observing, that there are Words of similar Sound and Signification in the *Northern* Languages: *Kerben*—*Karven*—*Georfan*—*Kervio*—*Corrbham*—*Carve*; so also, γαφω—*Graven*—*Grave*—*Engrave*—*Griffon*, all in different Languages of similar Sense and Sound; and all of which, if we must have a *Hebrew* Derivation, might come from כרה to dig, as it is now in *Hebrew*. The plural Verb or Noun, כרה might give the Sound; but as כרב by the Intermutability of *b*, *c*, *g*, *p*, *f*, *u*, &c. must be the original Sound, that it may be supposed to have had formerly the same Sense

Sense affixed to it some of these supposed Derivatives have, we must set aside מַלְאָכִים as a meer Conjecture, and the Conclusion from all this Sound, I mean *true hypothetic Reasoning*, is, (p. 406.) that "it will yield a Sense which
 " very well corresponds with the—*Image*—
 " *Work* in the Tabernacle and Temple."

But destroys all we have been a building on the Notion of the *Cherubs* being Angels; for this round-about far-fetched Etymology, which has as many lame Legs as *Fame* has Mouths, would directly prove, that God placed *graven Images* at *Eden*, to keep the Way of the Tree of Life; and our learned Controvertist, has, with one Dash of his Pen, destroyed all that four hundred and eighteen Pages have been labouring to establish. The Man that was computing his Gains from a Basket of Crockery Ware that he kicked down in his Dream, was not more unlucky. But stay, though the whole Building is undermined and tottering, there is a Battress in the next Page, so nicely proportioned, as not to be able to bear the additional Weight of a Fly upon it. "As *Signs* and the *Things*
 " *signified* by them are often found to interchange Names—so the Angels might be
 " called by the Name of their hieroglyphical
 " Representations." *i. e.* The Angels might be called *carved Images*. And so, because a *Picture* or *Piece of Painting* may interchange Names, he should have said, *may be called* an Angel or a Man, according to which it

is designed for, so *Angels*, or *Men*, may get the Name of *Statues* and *Paintings*? Is this agreeable to common Sense, or the Nature of Things? Whoever heard of a Man and his Statue *interchanging* Names, so as to call the Man a Statue? If Doctor *Sharp's* Head were exhibited in Brass or Wood, should we call him *brazen* or *Wooden Head*? And yet we should call the Bust a *Sharp*. Can the Mind, as the Doctor says, without some peculiar Turn of Fancy, rest in a Notion that the common Sense of Mankind contravenes? The Doctor, it is plain, saw the Difficulty attending his Derivation of the Word, and could not have given a stronger Instance of the Influence the Heart has on the Head in Reasoning, than he has done here; for if he really thinks that *carved Images* might become a Name for the *spiritual Angels*, because they were represented by Images, the Reader must pardon me, if I say, there is something wrong in his Head; if the Doctor doth not think so, but only flung it out as a Sort of a Cover over a weak Place, there is something worse elsewhere. But we shall want some better Authority than even Dr. *Sharp's* for so uncouth a Supposition; and a better Proof than *Signs* bearing the Name of *Things signified* is, that *Angels* or *Men* were ever called *Pictures*, *Paintings*, or *carved Work*, because there were Pictures of them. Let us apply this Derivation, as a supposed Name of the *Angels*,

Angels, to some Passages of Scripture—*Job*, his *carved Images* he charged with Folly, *Psalms*, Man did eat the *carved Images* Food, who maketh his *carved Images* Spirits; as this Etymology does the Appearance in Fire, *Ezek. x. 20*. I knew they were *carved Images*; and here let me ask how the Doctor knows that *Ezekiel*, “discovered—that the *החיות* he “saw were Angels or ministring Spirits,” as he says the Prophet did; for *Cherubim* does not signify *Angels*, only *Abusive*, according to his own Hypothesis: So that calling the *Creatures* *Cherubim*, is no Proof that he discovered them to be *Angels*. I have spent more Time upon this *Supposition*, than it seems to deserve in the Way of Reasoning; not meerly to shew the Insufficiency of it, but as it shews the Disposition of Mind of the candid Gentleman, and is a Specimen of his Manner of Disputing. I am unwilling to think he could really believe it probable, that *Pieces of Carving* could ever become a common Name for the *spiritual Angels*; though perhaps it may sound harsher to say, that he only flung it out as a Sort of a Cover over a weak Part in his Etymology. *Sober and modest Enquiry*, and *such* the Doctor *proposed* his should be, would not condescend to such Subterfuges.

If *Cherub* is not a single Word, it must be a compound one. Mr. H——n to whom the Christian World is so highly indebted for the Recovery of the Evidence in the *cherubical*

Figures, derives it from *ל* like, and *גדול* great, or a *Superior*. To which it was objected by Mr. B——d, that the *Hebrew* abhors Composition of Words *; that hasty Assertion was soon given up, and now it is, that it abhors *standing Compositions* with *Particles*, see the Doctor's *Cherubim*, p. 12. And we must find some *Particle* constantly prefixed (the *Caph* in particular) to some Noun, so as to become a standing Compound; and Abundance of Questions are asked with more than usual Quickness, Restrictions upon Restrictions, Distinction upon Distinction, and so many Exceptions are premised, that the *candid Enquirer* might well call it the *Onus*, to which he also might have added, the *Invidia, probandi*, upon us; and yet after all he doth not seem over desirous of joining Issue with us upon the *Custom* and *Genius* of the *Tongue*, notwithstanding all the Difficulties he has laid us under

* Dr. Sharp says, see his *Cherubim*, p. 11. "It is evident he meant not to disallow of Composition in *Hebrew* proper Names." Whence is it evident? Not from his *Observations*, p. 21. nor from any Thing he says elsewhere. The contrary is evident from the Passage Dr. Sharp refers to; because Mr. B——d immediately plays upon Mr. Catcott's *Christien* and *Sarkame*, as *parallel Instances*, to that of supposing *Cherub* to be a Compound. And in his *Examination*, p. 49. acknowledges he meant what he said of *common Names*, and doth not exclude the Names of the *Heathen Gods* out of his Assertion. How came Dr. Sharp so much better acquainted with Mr. B——d's Meaning than he was himself? Or was it only to find Mr. B——d's Opponent's shooting beside the Mark? Truth should be the *Aim* and *Guide* of the Pen of the Disputant.

der, compound Appellatives being rare in Hebrew, not enough I suppose to join issue upon. I shall cite a few, and leave it to the Reader to judge, how near they come to the Case in Point; premising, that as ב is a *Servile*, Instances of *Serviles* so compounded with a Noun or Name, will shew Mr. H——'s Etymology of *Cberub* to be agreeable to the Custom of the Language; which if it shall appear to be, it will let some Light in upon the dark Corner, the Scriptures are supposed to have set the *Cberubim* of Glory in. The Reply, Part II. to the Doctor, has proposed, p. 190.

בבל *Babel*, as one, ב in, בל *Confusionem*, or *Nililum*, "because the Lord did there confound." Gen. xi. 9. The Place and all their Projects there, were to come to nothing. The Reason assigned for the Name, bespeaks this Derivation. ב is often used in common Discourse in this Manner, Gen. xxx. 11, 13. בור in *Cætum*, a Troup; and באשרי to my Happiness. The City of *Babel* was for their God *Bel*; but the Lord God made it a *Confusion*.

בעז In *Strength*, is a standing Compound with the *Servile* ב, as a Name of another sacred Piece of Furniture for the Temple.

בריעה and ברעה, the Name of a Child, 1 Chr. vii. 23. and viii. 23. His Father says, "because it went evil with his House." which leaves no Doubt of the Word being

compounded of **ב** *in*, and **רעה** *Evil*; and it is used as a family Name.

כבול, A Name which *Hiram* gave some Cities in *Galilee*, *1 Kings ix. 13.* in Disgust. The Word must be a Compound of **כ** and **בול** to express that Dislike, and so derived, it does; for it then signifies *Worthless*, or *next to Nothing*, **כבל** is a Root of itself in *Hebrew*, but that expresses no Contempt or Displeasure, which is assigned as a Reason of imposing the Name; and I offer that *Displeasure* which gave Occasion to the Name, as a Voucher for the Derivation; and this Word is a standing Compound with a *Caph* as *Cberub* is.

כבר The Name of a River, from **כ** and **בר** is Conjecture only.

לחי To the living one, **רא** who took Notice of me, the Name of a Well, *Gen. xvi. 14.* and *xxv. 11.* are two Instances of *Serviles*, incorporated into such *Appellatives* as *Cberub* is.

מואב *Moab*, *Gen. xix. 36.* "because she had him by her Father," says *Marius*; and his Parentage bespeaks the Truth of the Etymology.

ראובן *Reuben*, and many others of the like Sort, have the *Serviles* incorporated into their Composition.

שלח A Flame, I offer upon the Authority of all the Learned, and the Sight of the Word, as a standing Compound of the *Servile* **ש** and **להב**.

שנער The Name of the Country, *Babel* was built in; from, ש which, נער *shall be shaken*: Under which Term the Downfall of Idolatry is so often predicted in the Prophets. see also *Heb. xii. 26, 27.*

If these and such like Instances do not shew the Custom of the Language, and Mr. H—'s Derivation of *Cherub* to be conformable to it; and if this, with what is proved with Regard to the Design of that important *Statue*, does not satisfy the good Doctor, we must leave it till we can find the good Woman of *Endor* to raise us up *Samuel* or one of the Prophets, to satisfy us by Word of Mouth; not but some would find a Way to evade even that, being wiser than the Prophets, whom they are able to teach how to write, as understanding their Language better than they did; and accordingly, make no Scruple to alter their Words, and write them differently, to render their Stile more *correct*, and more agreeable to the Rules of Grammar. Dr. *Sharp* has given us several Specimens of his superior Talent in this Way; one Instance of which we have under the present Enquiry, where he contends that what they write *Rab*, should be pronounced *Rub*; and would make one Word of two, as on other Occasions, two Words of one; for obvious Views, רוב *Rub* occurs five or six Times a Noun for *Greatness* in Number, but never as a *personal* Noun, *Great*. *Rab* occurs about a hundred and fifty Times for

Greatness in Number, or Multitude, and perhaps five hundred Times and more, for *great* in *Quality* or *Quantity*; from whence it appears that they used *Rab* and *Rub* in the same Sense. Dr. *Sharp* roundly asserts, that “ the Instances of it, (sc. רב or *Rub*) as a Noun expressive of *Multitude* are as common, as *Rab* or *Rabbim* for *great* and “ many,” p. 402. And refers to *Kircher*, a Book I have not by me, nor within Reach; but the Fact is so far from being true, that the Instances are a hundred to one against him. look into the Text itself; or into *Buxtorf*’s or *Marius de Calassio*’s *Concordance*, and it will soon appear how much *Kircher* has deceived the Doctor, if he has deceived him, because p. 26. he refers to three Places for רב in the *Hebrew Bible*, and says we find it elsewhere, which seems to imply he had examined the Places, which if he did, he must at the same Time see how egregiously *Kircher* was mistaken. The Sense of רב *Rab*, is different in different Places; but the same in great Numbers of Places, with *Rub*, which by the Rules of Grammar, might be used in the two Senses that *Rab* is, as well as in one of them.

But give the Distinction contended for, all the Weight that is desired, and *Rub* will signify *Greatness* either in *Dignity* or *Number*: For as *Marius* says, *Significat Multitudinem vel nomen formale Magnificentiae et Dominis*. Dr. *Sharp*, as we might expect, would prefer
Multitude,

Multitude, and make the Figures on the Ark.
 “ The Likeness, or Representation of the
 “ *Multitude* of the heavenly Hosts.” You
 may as well suppose one Bush to stand for a
 Wood, or one Tree for a Forest, as one Image
 for a *Multitude*. The Images were but two,
 and the Faces to each, but *four*; and could not
 stand for more than four Persons at most. It
 remains therefore, that Cherub was so named,
 because it was an Emblem of what had *Great-*
ness or *Superiority* in it. *Rub* is a Word of
 the same Signification with μεγαλωσυη *Majestas*,
Magnificentia, which St. Paul uses for the
 divine *Majesty*, at the right Hand of which
 the Man *Christ Jesus* sits in Glory, Heb. i. 3.
 A properer Word doth not occur in the *He-*
brew Tongue, or one more expressive of Dig-
 nity and Superiority; and of which the *Greek*
 is, according to the Doctor, a *literal Transla-*
tion; and it is applied to God, though in an-
 other Part of Speech, as is pretended; no doubt,
 says Dr. Sharp, כִּי when it is spoken of God,
 means great, as great can be; and when
 spoke of the *Majesty on High*, will carry the
 Idea of *Supreme* with it, and certainly is as ap-
 plicable to the Divinity, in the Part of Speech
 the Doctor contends *Rub* in *Cherub* must be
 construed in, as St. Paul’s μεγαλωσυη or our
 Word *Majesty* is. So the Old-Testament
 describes *Christ hieroglyphically*, “ on the
 “ right Hand of the Throne of the *Majesty in*
 “ *the Heavens* ;” and the New-Testament in
 Words,

Words, that are a *literal Translation* of *Che-
rub*, considered with the *Glory*, and *Holy of
Holies*, it stood in; and it is something re-
markable, that *Cherub*, according to its *Hebrew
Meaning*, should speak so great and important
a Truth, in the very *Stile* *St. Paul* does: The
Cherub in the *Holy of Holies*, being *literally*
“ a Figure of the Majesty in the Heavens.”
I fancy our learned Antagonist was not aware
what Advantage he was giving his Adversaries,
and may be convinced by and by as much as
they are, that his Distinction cannot be de-
fended. But if it could, there are three Per-
sons of the supreme *Majesty*; and each Person
is by himself entitled to the same Name, each
Person being *Jehovah*; and by himself, *God*
and *Lord*; and the King of Kings; *Christ
Jesus* may also be called *his Majesty*, as his
Substitute on Earth is. But that *Rub* or *Rab*,
is a *peculiar distinguishing* or *appropriated*
Title of God, in Mr. H——n's Sense of it,
is one of those Mistakes I have so frequently
had Occasion to rectify. But that it is a proper
Title, and an *Epithet* of God, is not, I think,
disputed; and is as properly spoke of God, in
the Doctor's Sense of *Rub*, as ours; and per-
haps more so. And it must be confessed, that
St. Paul's Phraseology seems to justify the
Doctor's Distinction, and to lead to the Trans-
lation of *Rub* by *Greatness* or *Majesty* on this
Occasion, though by the Rules of Grammar
it may be construed either Way, and it is
written

written also both Ways in the *Plural* of *Cherub*.

There is one Nicety more, with which I shall dismiss this Subject, and that is, an Inaccuracy in the Use of *Cherubim* for *Cherub*, which seeming to go on a Supposition, that *Cherubim* is commonly *spoke* of one Figure or Statue, the Doctor has discovered the Cheat, as he would have it thought, but seems too full of it to give it Utterance, or shew clearly how he apprehends it affects the Dispute. And he makes it a *Head in his Contents*, "Cherubim and Cherub not duly distinguished by Mr. H——n and his Followers," as if it were peculiar to them, and introduced by Mr. H——n as of Service to his Cause. The Reply has shewn the Insufficiency of the Doctor's Argument, founded on this Observation of his.

"*They* (sc. *the conjunct Emblems, or three Emblems in Conjunction, see the preceding Page*) are not *stiled* Cherubim, but only Cherub; and therefore, are not, as they say, *Representative of Rubbim*," p. 89.

All that the Doctor pretends to have proved, is, that one compound Image is not called *Cherubim* but only *Cherub*; therefore he infers too much, that the *conjunct Emblems* are not *Cherubim* or *Representative of Rubbim*, which he seems sensible of in the next Section, and he should only have said, *are not stiled so*; which besides proving *idem per idem*, (*they are not stiled*

filed Cherubim, therefore they are not filed Cherubim) is not a very material Distinction, because *each conjunct Emblem is called a Cherub*, and so all three are *Cherubim*, though not called so in one Word. And the Doctor may see, that all Mr. H—n has built on *Cherubim* is proved from *Cherub*; for a Cherub was a *sicut Rubbim* or *Image*, consisting of *Cherubim* in union. And Mr. H—n has so often distinguished this Point, that if he has sometimes fallen into the common Phrase, I cannot but say, it would better have become the wrangling Disputant, than the candid Enquirer to have taken the little Advantage. As *Pererius* before cited, has observed, “ *Ezekiel* “ twice speaks of them in the singular Num- “ ber, as if there were but one Animal, though “ according to *numerical Distinction* they “ were four distinct Animals, but by Figure “ one Animal;” and so *Cherub* may and ought to be considered as a Noun of Number, where it is spoke of one compound Figure. In his next *Review*, the Doctor will have considered, it is to be hoped, more maturely the Influence of this Observation on our Dispute, and shew us the Difference betwixt *calling* three conjoined Emblems, each a *Cherub*; and all of them together *Cherubs* or *Cherubim*. All that I can gather from this favourite Section at present is, that the Word *Cherub* is not the Word *Cherubim*; the one being in the *singular* Number, the other in the *plural*.
And

And the Fallacy which has been spun out into so many Words, and made to look as big and formidable as a Castle in the Clouds, consists in suppressing Part of the Meaning of the Word *Cherub*, which stands certainly for the compound Image; but it does so too for *each Emblem* in the Compound; and though the Prophet did not call them all together by the *plural* Name, yet he does to all Intents and Purposes call them *Cherubim*, if three or four are to be spoke of in the *plural Number*. Nor does the Translation by *Images of the great one*, which the Doctor contends for, take in the whole Meaning of *Cherub*, when used by us, as it certainly may be used by us, in the *plural Number* of the *conjunct Emblems*; for they were by Conjunction *one*; by their Number more *than one*. If a Prophet says, that a Bull and a Lion-Man with an Eagle, though conjoined, were each an Image of a great one, and he call the Compound, *an Image* (in the *singular Number*) surely we have Authority to call them all *an Image of the great ones*: I say *an Image*, because *quatenus* a Statue they were but one; but it comes to the same, if you call them *Images of the great ones* in union.

The Point objected to by the Doctor, is using the Word *Cherubim* in the *plural Number* for one compound Emblem, with Respect to the component Emblems; and the Objection is, that it " is never mentioned otherwise
" than

" than as the Plural of *Cberub* or *cherublc*
 " *Figure*—and is no where used for a *Plu-*
 " *rality*—in one Figure," p. 95. A meer
 Collusion, because each component Emblem,
 which this Objection denies, is called a *Cberub*,
 and it is a Mistake, a known one I doubt, to
 say, " the Prophet makes no Distinction of
 " *coupled* or double, or quadruple," p. 97.
 He says, chap. xli. a Cherub had two Faces,
 and chap. i. and x. mentions another Cherub
 with four Faces, and calls each of the four by
 the same Name; and if this is not making the
 Distinction, so peremptorily denied, what
 Words could he have made it in?

Teraphim a plural Noun, is used for one
 Image or Representative of *Jehovah*, the ever
 blessed Trinity of Persons, and has been
 offered as a parallel Instance to our Usage of
 the Word *Cberubim*, a plural Name for a
 plural Image, or an Image in one Respect
 one, but as to its *Composition* more than one,
 and therefore to be called by a singular or plu-
 ral Name indifferently, as God, the Persons
 represented, is. But as *Cberubim* never occurs
 for one Emblem, so on the other Hand the
 singular of *Teraphim* never occurs. But then
 it must be observed, that one Word is used
 in the plural for what we know was in one
 Respect, a single Image; and the other Word
 in the singular, for what we know was a plural
 Image, which is the sole Point in Dispute.
 One Image or Emblem is called by a plural
 Name

Name, from being, (as we presume sufficiently proved) a *Plurality* of Emblems in one. The Doctor disputes this, " as *Teraph* is never mentioned, we cannot be sure that "*Teraphim* has a plural Meaning," p. 89. of his *Cberubim*. The Word is *plural*, and considered as having a *plural* Meaning, *Gen. xxxi. ver. 32.* "*Rachel* had stolen *them* ; *ver. 34.* "*Rachel* had taken the *Teraphim*, and put "*them* in the Camel's Furniture and sat upon "*them.*" And *Zach. x. 2.* " The *Teraphim* "*רברו* *they* speak Vanity." This is sufficient to shew the Word was considered, as having a *plural Meaning* as well as Termination ; and so here is a plural Word for one Image. Will a candid Enquirer entertain any Doubt about the Reason of this *Plurality*, when he reflects what great Numbers of Images the Heathen World had, with several Heads to one Body, or several animal Forms combined into one Statue, and when we find from divine Authority that the same compound Emblem was considered as one or more, according to the Number of distinct Emblems united ? A Man must wink hard not to see here. " — If the Plurality of the Number in *Tera-* "*pbim*, continues our candid Enquirer, was "*founded on some Plurality in the Thing—* "*yet no further Conclusion can be drawn* "*from thence, till we are able, not merely to* "*fancy, but to shew on good Grounds,* "*wherein that Plurality consisted. And I* "*am*

" am determined not to allow any to be good
 " Grounds, but a Sight of the very Image,
 " and an express Declaration from the People
 " themselves, that they called it by a plural
 " Name, because it was a Plurality of Em-
 " blems, or animal Forms in one. Tell me
 " not of Janus, Jupiter, Serapis, Sol, Hecate,
 " Diana, Proserpine, and no Body knows who
 " all, with three or four Heads a-piece : It is
 " all Heathen Abomination. And Virgil's
 " *tria Virginis*, or a Diana, a more than
 " double-tongued Witness, I heed none of them."

The Doctor requires good Grounds; and so
 does the Sower; or he sows to little Purpose.
 He that would learn must have a willing Mind.
 You may make a Man feel, but you can never
 make him see against his Will. To try to
 doubt; to labour for Evasion hurts the Mind,
 as much as looking against the Sun does the
 Eyes; it dazles and confounds the Sight; and
 prepares the Way for that worst of Enemies,
 who comes with *short* but *quick* Steps. St.
Paul's honest and zealous Temper was so far
 biassed by being bred up under a doubting
Rabbi, that he *verily thought* there was no
 Evidence for *Christ* in the Old Testament,
 and like some who now a-days cry aloud for
 the secular Arm against the *Hutchinsonians*,
imprisoned and stoned to Death, those who
 did. The Disputant may think perhaps it is
 consistent with that Character to dissemble the
 Truth; suppress his own Sentiments; and
 argue

argue against Conviction, to try how far Objections would go; these and other such Pretences, striking in with the little natural Pride of our Nature, and the much greater that grows to imaginary Dignity, Superiority and Learning, shall blind even a *Gamaliel*, who could see the Apostles had wrought a notable Miracle, *and he could not deny it*; but would not see the Voice of God in their Doctrine, which he could deny. We have a remarkable Instance of this *sober, modest and candid* Spirit of Enquiring, *Mark xi*. The Chief-Priests demand of our Lord by what Authority he acted. "I will also ask of you one Question," says our Lord. The Baptism of *John*, was "it from Heaven or of Men?" They are afraid of the Truth because it was against them, and agreed not to own it; and they are afraid of the People, and dare not deny it; and therefore, pretend Ignorance. But what is all this to our Dispute? I hope nothing. To return.

The present Point in Contest, was, whether a *plural Noun* were used for one Emblem. When that is proved, the Answer is, it may not have a plural Meaning notwithstanding. But as that sounds extremely harsh in itself, and is contradicted by Usage; and will go down with few but who deny a Trinity. Next *we must shew wherein that Plurality consisted*. But why so? A plural Noun supposes a Plurality of what it is a Name of. *Teraphim*

a plural Noun, was the Name of one Emblem, or one Representative of *Aleim* Gods; therefore it was a plural Emblem. Common Sense justifies this Inference. Calling a *Diana*, a *Hecate*, or a *Janus*, *Triceps*, *Triformis* or *Quadriceps*, does not say plainer, they were plural Images, than calling one Image, *the Healers*, i. e. Image of the Healers, (or whatever else may be the precise Meaning of *Teraph*) does that *it* was so, or rather, that *they* (for so the one Image is spoken of) were so, and this, as I have shewn, is justified in *Substance*, if not in *Form*, by the Prophet *Ezekiel* in his Usage of the Word *Cherub*. And so again, *Aaron's Bull*, which was one Image, is called *Act. vii. 41. Gods*, and *Works of their Hands*. And *Isai. xlii. 17. מַסַּכָּה* a molten Image, is spoke to in the plural Number—*Ye are our Gods*. A plural Image, no doubt, then it was. And so might *Ashtoreth*, *Chemosh*, *Milcom*, *the Gods*, (though the Doctor renders it the *Goddeſs* and the *God*) of some Heathen Nations; nay, we have the *Evidence* of our Senses for it, because their Images, the Portrait of which is preserved, were in such vast Numbers of the plural Sort. And though one would not care to give one's Oath, that this or that *Hecate*, *Proserpine* or *Diana*, with their three or four Heads, were the *Ashtoreth* of the *Zidonians*, or *Chemosh*, or *Milcom*, or, &c. yet the high Probability, nay Certainty, that many Nations had such, or such like Images,

Images, ought to abate a little of the *Assurance* with which the Doctor delivers it as his Opinion that *Aleim* is predicted of one single Image; or one single Potentate or Power. And besides, the Heathens worshipped the Heavens, which are three Powers or Agents; and therefore, their *Images* ought to have been, as we know so many of them were, *plural* or *multi-form*. *Janus*, *Jupiter*, *Serapis*, *Sol*, *Diana*, *Proserpine*, *Hecate*, *Geryones*, *Mercury*, and many others, were all either of triple, or quadruple Form, or *plural* Images. These are the chief of their Gods, and seem most of them to be of the *Hebrew* Derivation. *Serapis*, שרף; *Diana*, דיענו; *Proserpine*, חַיִּין, שרפין, and the Greek prefix πρὸς; *Hecate*, חקת, in the Sense of Law-giver, or *Statuary*; *Geryones*, from גרי, *Pavores*, *Fears*, and נחש; *Mercury* or *Hermes*, from הרים. But *hæc obiter*. But they were all *multi-form*; and so also might חמנים the *Sun-Images* be, for it is very well known that their brazen Bulls, Lyons, and other *Pyræthia*, had seven *Claustra* or *Conclavia*, in which they burnt different Offerings; and their Children in the last or furthestmost; and they might have as many Heads, and yet two or more of these πυράθια might be spoke of under the same Word; and according to the Context, the same *plural Word* shall be either one compound Image, or Duplicates of the same Kind. A Distinction though so very material, the Doctor has not

Q 2

given

given a due Weight to ; and yet it is as *obvious* as it is material. I wish I could persuade the Doctor to look over once more, without Prejudice or Animosity, *Heb. Writ. Pref. p. 380—390.* and see how general these combined Emblems of the *Plurality* of the *Powers*, i. e. *Agents*, in the *Power* they worshipped, were : And *Hieroglyphicks* are not capable of changing their Tongue ; the Images live still, and speak for themselves.

We have shewn that *Teraphim* is a *plural* Noun, and considered as having a *plural* Meaning ; and was a *Representative* of *Jehovah Aleim*, of whom the Scripture speaks by plural and singular Words both. Do not our best *Christian* Writers acknowledge, that the *singular* Words refer to Unity of Essence, and the *plural*, to Plurality of Persons * ? Have we not then good Grounds to conclude,

* See that eminent and universal Scholar Bishop *Beveridge*, Sermon on *John x. 30.* — “ To make himself known, as plain as Words can do it, to our Capacities, all along in the Old-Testament, he calls himself by two Names especially, using sometimes the one, sometimes the other, sometimes both together ; and they are, יהוה and אלהים. The first, *Jehovah*, signifies *Essence*, or Being in general — The other Name, *Elohim* (as pointed) is of the plural Number—which plainly shews, that, though this universal Essence or Being be but one, yet there are several Persons or Subsistencies so existing in it, that they are all, and every one, that one Essence or Being, p. 2.” And presently after—the most infallible Exposition of this Phrase in the New (*sc. 1 John v. 7.*) where he says in *Moses, Deut. vi. 4.* “ Hear, O *Israel*, the Lord our God (our אלהים in the plural Number) is יהוה אחד one *Jehovah*.”

clude, that the Emblem was called by a plural Name, because of the Plurality of Emblems in it? Can we reasonably doubt, whether Believers in the true God endeavoured, by their Emblems of him, to represent the *Distinction* of Persons, and Incarnation of one of them, on which so much, nay, the whole of their Religion and Hopes, depended? Or, if this had not come into our Heads before, would not a *plural Image*, or a compound of several Emblems in one, be Proof *beyond meer Fancy*, that it was the Plurality of Persons, in the one Essence of God, they aimed at describing? That the *Teraphim* was designed for the true God appears too plain to be disputed. Why might not the People then call the one Emblem by a *plural Name*, as the one God is?

The Derivation of TERAPHIM.

I have taken upon me to construe several Words and Phrases relating to the sacred Emblems of the Antients, which the Commentators have not agreed in, or not explained, apparently, to their own Satisfaction, or only according to the rabbinical *Impositions*; for they should not be called *Expositions*. I shall offer at a Derivation of this Word; and lay it, as I have done the other, before the Publick, with as much real Deference, as they

who found the Trumpet before them, and their own great Humility and Candour.

It will not be disputed, I apprehend, by any one, that פֶּחַד Gen. xxxi. 53. *The Fear of Isaac*; means *him whom Isaac feared*; and perhaps מַלְצָח Terriculamentum, was given as a Name by Maachab, 1 Kings xv. to her Idol in the like Sense. The abominable Impurities of their filthy Rites may suggest a further Reason for that Name; but *Isaac's Fear* means no more than the *God he feared*; whom he *feared and trembled before*, רָחַף either with an *e*, a double *pe* or *vau*, signifies, to *quail*, *abate* Heat or Courage, or Anger, Rage or Violence; to *sink* as the Mind or Spirits do in Fear. Teraphim is a regular plural Noun from רָחַף with the Prefix ת *; and I would explain it as *Piscator* in Leigh does *Rephaim*, *Eo quod ad illorum conspectum homines languescant*. Those before whom Men tremble and are cast down. I shall cite but a Passage or two for the Idea of the Word, viz. Job xxvi. 11. "The Pillars of Heaven יְרוּפּוּ" "tremble, and are astonished at his Presence."

Pf.

* Formed as תַּמְרוּרִים *Troubles*, from אָנָה, תַּמְרוּרִים from מָרַר Hof. xii. 14. *Bitterness*. תַּמְנוּי Lev. vi. 21. Either from אָפָה as they say, or פָּן, from the Form and Make of the Cakes. Many others might be produced, but these are sufficient, as רָפָה signifies to *assuage*, *mitigate*, or *abate*, it rather *implies*, than directly expresses *healing*, though a proper Word on many Occasions, and differs from רָפָא to *heal*, as that signifies to *repair*, *restore*, or *rebuild*.

Pf. xlv. 11. רָפוּ "Be still, and know that I am God." It implies Submission and yielding to him. This Derivation is regular, and the Sense of the Name proper, and conform to others on the like Occasions; and, if Believers, such as *Terah, Abraham, Nabor, Laban, Michah, David* and others, had them as Images of the true God, then the Prohibitions against the making such *Representatives* of God have been too fondly prest into the Service against the *Cherubim*; and prove the Reverse of what they are brought for, namely, That those Prohibitions forbid the pious Servants of God from making any but what were Representatives of the true God; and that both they, and the Temple Images were Substitutes of the true Objects of their Fear and Worship, which Angels or any other Creatures were not.

And the different Names are adapted with the greatest Propriety to the different Ends they were made for. Those on the Ark represented the ever-blessed Trinity, *at least, some Persons* in Majesty and Glory, with a Man in that Glory with them; and therefore are called, *an Image, or Similitude of the Majesty as it is in Heaven.* They were for the publick and annual Atonement, and of standing Use as Memorials or Records; were not to be bowed down to, nor approachable by any, but the High-Priest, who was only to sprinkle the Blood of the grand Atonement,

ment, and fume the Incense to them once a Year.

The *Teraphim* were for private Use, and Representatives of the Presence of the *Aleim* amongst them at their Family, or with any of them at their private Devotions, where no Glory appears; and are properly named, *Those before whom they humbled themselves*, or cast themselves down in Prayer and Contrition. They did not represent God as in *Majesty* above, but as below on Earth; and as *Objects of Worship* present to them. They were indeed *the Persons of the Majesty*, but not as in *Majesty*, and could not be so properly called *Cberubim* as *Teraphim*, the Family-Gods before whom they humbled themselves continually. That which I now offer as the Derivation of this Name, is the only one that is *directly regular*; and is proper as a Title for their domestick God, whose continual Sight was to keep them in continual awe, and before whom they were to express it; or as Guardians and tutelar Deities, to keep their Enemies in awe of them.

There is a Passage which seems to blame the Use of *Teraphim* only or chiefly, as it implied an over forward Zeal; the being *better* than commanded to be: An Error that leads weak, but well-meaning, People astray the soonest of any. *Saul* had disobeyed the Command of God out of Self-Will, and suspended the *severe Orders* of God with Regard to
Agag,

Agag, and saved the best of the Spoil, to do Honour to God with ; he pleads this to Samuel, who, chap. xv. 22. tells him, " To obey is better than Sacrifice; and to harken than the Fat of Rams." *For the Sin of* ~~DDP~~ *Divination* (sc. the devising or guessing at what does, or ought to please God) is *Rebellion*; and *Aven* and *Teraphim*, *Stubborness*, the being self-willed : As if the setting up *Aven* and *Teraphim* was that self-willed Obstinacy of devising a Religion, or the Means of Religion, without the divine Directions, or going beyond them. Therefore, the New-Testament orders us, as well as the Old, to *cast down Imaginations, and bring into Captivity every Thought into the Obedience of Christ* : A Servant giving more Satisfaction who scrupulously obeys his Orders, than he, who is so wise, as to be wiser than his Master, and act upon his own Head. I have rendered the Passage above in the Order the Words stand in the Original; and they directly reach *Saul's* Excuse; and let him know what Mischiefs flow from that Wilfulness which sets Men above the Commands of God, whose Wisdom, as whose Power, can know no Equal, and will admit of no Controul or Distrust. The wilful Alterations introduced into their divine Service, by weak or pretently religious Men, had produced Mischiefs enough to appeal to; and the *Teraphim* had given Occasion to great Abuses in many,

though

though not in all Places ; and in a few Years after this were so misapplied, as to render it necessary to destroy them universally through the Kingdom of *Israel*. But whether I am right or wrong, with regard to the *Teraphim* being for private, because they seem to be set up at *Dan* for publick Use, yet the Word is *plural*, considered as such, and was an Emblem of the true God used by true Believers.

These are some of the Proofs, that the *cherubic Faces* were the *Sub-Deity* of the true Believers : Not Angels or any other Creatures ; but the *Shadows* only to which they paid the *Shadows* of the divine Worship ; their Hearts and Souls being raised above both the *Shadows* of the Images to which, and the *Shadows* of their Ceremonies, in which they represented their Hope of an Atonement, and all the good Things promised them by the ever-blessed Trinity, *Jehovah Aleim* ; *Jehovah* who had bound himself to them, and them to him, in a perpetual League, offensive and defensive, by denouncing a Curse against every one that should not keep *all the Words of the Law* ; by which he became *Confederates* with all the true *Israel* against all Opposers.

The apostate *Jews* have taken great Pains to cast a Veil over the Old-Testament, and to hide from *Christians* the Things of *Christ* contained in it ; and have succeeded but too well.

well. But then this Veil is not on the Scripture as transmitted to us by the Church of God, or *the Original itself*, but only as it is transmitted to us in the *Writings* of these, the first and principal Head of *Anti-Christ*; and it is strangely preposterous, if not something worse, in any, *to complain of their being kept in Ignorance by them; and if the Case be so, to charge it as a Crime on our blessed Lord and his Apostles, in so far neglecting their Interest, as not to expound to them what their and our Enemies have so industriously kept out of Sight.* Is not calling these Men blind Guides, and telling us, the Veil was upon their Heart, sufficiently providing for our Interest? And is not *Christ's* directing us to the original Scripture, sufficiently instructing us where to look for the Evidence of himself? Their Constructions can't contain that Evidence; they did not see it themselves; they would not see it.—Leave wrangling; search honestly; examine candidly—In short, pluck the *old Man* out of the Heart with the natural Pride of our Nature; and be not led away with the *Giddiness of nominal Dignity*, and no Fear, but the *old* Scripture will be found explicit enough, and not to stand in need of any further Assistance from the *new*, than we find there, with regard to the Subjects it has been thought proper to treat of in it.

No

No Confusion of Tongues at *Babel*.

THE original Language, whether it survived the Affair of *Babel* or not, must have been taught *Adam* by God himself, because *speaking* is but *Imitation*, and he who never heard another speak, would never speak himself. The first Language therefore, must come from Heaven; and no doubt partook of the Perfection of its divine Author, as far as a Language could. It is generally held that the *biblical Hebrew* is the first Language; our own Church calls it *the antientest Tongue*, in which she follows the *Fathers*; as the Learned in general do. But as this Position bears hard upon the modern Spirit of Criticism; and condemns the Freedoms taken with the Old-Testament, almost of Prophaness; the Antiquity and Perfection of the *Hebrew*, must by all Means, and by any Means, be set aside. That *Noah* spoke the Language of *Lamech* his

his Father, and *Lamech* of his Progenitors, in the holy Line up to *Adam*, with all whom he was cotemporary, seems to bespeak its own Evidence. For what could occasion any Change in the Language of *Adam*? A Language taught him by his Creators must have recommended itself to his Judgment and Esteem, and he must want the Inclination, if he had it in his Power, to discard it. But suppose him willing, where was the Opportunity of getting another Tongue? And as the Heirs of the holy Line lived with the Fathers of it, *Lamech* at fifty-six, as he was when *Adam* died, and above a hundred and sixty when *Seth* died, must have learnt their Tongue, and could have no other, supposing there had been any other in being, at that Time, than what they taught his Fathers. *Sound* is a fleeting Thing, and Languages vary in a Course of Years, or in a Number of Generations, not merely of Course indeed, but by some Accident or other in a Length of Time. No such Change can take Place in a Generation or two; or within the Lives of two or three Cotemporaries. The Length of the Lives of Men before the Flood, and of those who survived it, and of their Descendants, for three or four Successions, and their being but one Language at first, both before and after the Flood, alters the Case extreamly from what it is at present with regard to the *Fluctuation* supposed naturally incident to Language in general.

The

The Authors of the *Universal History*, argue to this Purpose, B. I. C. II. Sect. v. “ — the “ few Ages between the Creation and the “ Flood, and the long Lives of the *Ante-diluvians*, would effectually prevent any great “ Alteration.” Dr. *Sharp* could not help seeing this when he borrowed so much from this Chapter against the Antiquity of the *Hebrew*; and in fair Reasoning should have taken this Point into Consideration, when he was urging the changeable *Nature of Languages* as a Proof of a like *Change* in the primitive Language before the Flood. From *Adam* to *Lamech*; from *Lamech* to *Shem*; and from *Shem* to *Abraham*; though it be above two thousand Years, is but four Links in the Chain of Tradition, and is no more than equivalent to four or five Descents with us, or to the Space of three or four hundred Years. *Lamech* being fifty-six at the Death of *Adam*, and *Shem* ninety-three at the Death of *Lamech*, and *Abraham* fifty-five when he left *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, the Place of his Nativity, and till then the Residence of the holy Line, it is hardly possible their Language should differ from each other’s. We may safely say, it could not without a *Miracle*; such indeed it is pretended, there was some Time within the Life of *Peleg*, or within three hundred Years after the Flood, or thereabouts. But there was nothing before the Flood, that could occasion any material Difference, such as we find in
Languages

Languages now. *Cain* indeed was banished from the Conversation of *Adam* and the Church of God and lived at a Distance from them, for some Years. How long, we are not told, but by what is said *Gen. iv. 23.* the fatal Coalition that *corrupted the Way of all Flesh*, and brought on the Flood, began to take Place in the fourth Generation. But where should *Cain*, or his sons, get another Language, than what they had from him, and he from *Adam*? He had no other than his own, or the Descendants of *Adam* to talk with, and the Trees and Beasts could not teach him a new Set of Words; what Alterations could the *one Language* undergo, in these two Lines within the Life of *Adam*, or of those who had it from him? Seventeen Centuries were but the Lives of two Men, who had conversed with each other, whatever some People may think of *their easily conceiving how much the Language of Paradise must have changed in the Days of Noah*, they will not find it so easy to prove, or assign any *probable Cause* for such a Change. The Length of their Lives before the Flood, and the Cohabitation of the Heirs of the holy Line, and Intercourse and Connection in Matters of Religion; and there being no other Language to borrow from, secured the *one Language* from all such Change. But "the first Inhabitants of the Earth were few in Number," Doctor *Sharp's Antiq.* p. 62.
 True,

True, first, there was but one; then two; and after the Flood, only eight at first, —So that as Arts were invented, and as Science was improved, Language of course would be enlarged.—” He that knew all that God taught *Adam*, and carried Science as far as such a Scholar must do under such a Master, in the Course of *nine hundred Years*, would have Words enough for all Occasions; or for every Topic, which Religion and Nature can supply, and need not desire to be a better Linguist. What is there in the Heavens above, or the Earth beneath, that *Adam* had not given Names to? And what did God teach *Adam* so much for, and continue his Life so long, but that he might teach and instruct his Children? And what Arts or Science, had the *Ante-diluvians*, or what Subjects to invent Words for, *which the Scripture treats of*, that did not come under *Adam's* Cognizance? The Language of the *first Pair* was sufficiently copious and extensive, for all the Subjects of Philosophy and Divinity. But then, *Noah* and his Family came, *as it were*, into a new World, stocked with new and strange Things; the Ground was not to be cultivated in the same Manner perhaps; and perhaps was not in the same State. Some have supposed the State of the Clouds and Meteors was different also; and so it might not rain in the same Manner it does now; Ice and Snow might be hot; and Fire cold. The Beasts, Trees, Water, and

and so forth, might be different Things, and the old Names not suit them after the Flood. And Men were permitted to eat Meat after the Flood, which some suppose they were not before. To this Purpose reasons Dr. *Sharp*, and seemingly, seriously, in his *Antiquity*, p. 99. *et. seq.* and concludes, " These Alterations in Nature, as well as in Diet, would occasion new Terms in Things of common Experience and Usage." These Alterations all depend upon a *perhaps*, and have not the Shadow of a Reason to support them. However, the Heavens were not changed; and the *Alteration* made in the Earth was rectified. The Water from the great Abyss passed its Shell, and dissolved it; and that Water was returned to its Receptacle, the central Hollow, again, and the Face of the Earth was renewed. It was the same *Earth*, it was before, and every living Thing, and every Herb, Plant or Seed, was what had lived before the Flood. And it is to be hoped, the Doctor will allow that God and his divine Attributes, had undergone no Change by the Flood; nor the Soul, or Shape of the Body of Man; and if neither God nor the Heavens, Man nor Religion, Animals or the Vegetables were changed; and one would think that the *Atoms* of Water, Earth, or any other of the Elements could not be changed, what mighty Stock of new Words would *Noah* stand in need of after the Flood, for the new Things he should meet

R. *et. seq.* with?

with? Can we suppose that Dr. Sharp is in earnest in this Way of *perbapsing*, and calling it *reasoning*? From all *notick* Reasons he presumes the *Noachical Language* would keep changing till the Days of *Hiber*, (whose Son *Paleg* was born within a hundred Years of the Flood) and thinks nothing but a standing Miracle could preserve it for so long a Time. But what preserves a Language now, amidst a Variety of other Languages for many Generations? And what shall we think of the Doctor's Sagacity in calling it a most *reasonable* Supposition, that a Language should change in for hundred Years * before the Flood, when Men lived to the Age of eight or nine hundred Years, as much as it would now, when Men live only to seventy or eighty? Surely if Men lasted then ten or twelve Times as long as they do now, their Language must do so too; and Mr. *Moody's* Conclusion the Doctor pretends to make so light of, is a most rational one; for if the same Generation endured from *Henry the First*, to *Henry the Eighth*, it might safely be concluded, that the Language of one Age was the Language of the other; and this must necessarily have held in this or any other Country, unless the People had been changed, as they were wont to be in the *East*, when a Conqueror had over-run a Country, or there had been People of a different Language to have been incorporated with them.

See *Antiq.* p. 71.

them. Was the Doctor afraid of the true State of the Case, that he represents it so short and wide of the Truth ? From the *Exodus* to *Hezekiah* was upwards of seven hundred Years ; what Alteration had *Hebrew* undergone in all that Time, though the Age of Man was then reduced to the present Standard ? Read *Genesis* and *Isaiab*, or *Jeremiab* afterwards, or *Ezekiel* at the Beginning of the Captivity, and what Alteration do you find ? And if the Language continued the same for seven or eight hundred Years, when Men lived only seventy or eighty, it could not stand in Need of a Miracle to preserve it for seventeen hundred, when Men lived eight or nine hundred Years, and two Men's Lives outrun that Space of Time. Nor could there want a standing Miracle, to preserve it, for *one hundred Years* after the Flood, to the Birth of *Peleg*, while they were all one People ; for whom should they borrow new Words from ? What further Improvement in the Knowledge of Nature or Religion could *Noah* and *Sbem* arrive at, than they had before the Flood ? And what should induce *Noah* and *Sbem* from whom *Abraham* might have his Language, to adopt new and corrupted Words, and change their own Stile, *Grammar*, and Way of Speaking ? They and the intermediate Patriarchs to *Terab* were all living at a Time, and *Noah* as well as *Sbem* and *Heber*, outlived the supposed *miraculous* Change of Tongues, many Years.

Terah the Father of *Abraham* was one hundred and eighteen Years old at the Death of *Peleg*; in whose Days the Division of the Earth was: But he lived after that with the Fathers of the holy Line among the *Chaldeans* at *Ur*, for Years. We conclude then, from the Length of Men's Lives before the Flood, and the Want of any other Language to borrow from, that the Language of *Noah* after the Flood, was the same it was before; and the same he had from his Father, and that the same he had from *Adam*. And whatever Alterations, Additions, Improvements, Advantages or Disadvantages, *Cain* or his Progeny may be supposed to have brought into their Language, and to have communicated to the Sons of God on their Intermarriages, the Doctor will please to remember that we have not the Language from them that had *corrupted their Way*, but from *Noah* and his Family, who had not corrupted their Way; nor held any unlawful Intercourse with those early Innovators in Language, (as the Doctor without any Foundation tells us the *Cainites* were) and Religion. We have the Tongue from *Prophets*, Men inspired with the Spirit of God; Men neither sunk into a Corruption of Religion, or in the Barbarism or Impropriety of the Language of ordinary and ignorant People. The Doctor supposes the Language was transmitted to us through the Hands of those who could arbitrarily fix new Ideas to the Words;

Words; which is another of his Mistakes, and the contrary one of the Peculiarities belonging to the primæval Tongue, which he does not care to attend to. *Abraham* might have it from *Sbem*, as it is certain *Noah* had his Language from his Father *Lamech*, as *Lamech* might immediately from *Adam* himself; and as there was no Change in *Religion* or *Nature* before the Flood, to the Heirs of the holy Line, who *did not corrupt their Way* when all other Flesh had, the Language of *Adam* must be as pure in the Mouth of *Noah* at the Time of the Flood, as the *Faith* was. What Alterations or Changes were made in the *Nature* of the Things of the Earth, when the Doctor can prove any such, and the Names for those new Things, will be all his Property who can find them out: An Argument founded upon a meer *perhaps* so; and the Inferences from thence built upon as Certainties, are a certain Proof of the Want of a better Argument; but of nothing else, except of a Disposition of Mind not altogether so candid as were to be wished for.

The Doctor's Sect. III. which I have been keeping my Eye upon, is entitled, *The Assertion, that the biblical Hebrew was the Language in Paradise fully considered*. He may have fully considered it; but he has stated it very short. The Alterations and Innovations of the *Cainites* before the Flood, and the same or the like of Apostates after it,

could not be transmitted down to us by the Prophets or Fathers of the holy Line, who kept themselves clear of their Corruptions, and were under the Influence of the holy Spirit of God. The great Length of their Lives before the Flood, and so comparatively, the Shortness of the Time, did not admit of any material Alterations before the Death of *Noah* and *Shem*, in the ordinary or natural Course of the Change of Language: The same Man would keep his own Tongue and his natural or accustomed Way of speaking for his own Life-Time. *Shem*, at a Hundred Years old, must have got into a Stile of his own, and Language of his Father, which he would of course adhere to; and as he out-lived the Affair of *Babel* or *Dispersion*, so many Years, those of the holy Line who lived under his Eye, as *Abraham* himself did, till he removed to *Haran* in the fifty-fifth Year of his Age, must have the same Language he had. The same Causes that contributed to the keeping of *Hebrew* in its Purity under *Israel* in *Canaan*, would keep it so under *Shem* in *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, viz. in the first Place, The Shortness of the Time. 2dly, The Diversity of their religious Customs, and a standing Church-Service, &c. 3dly, Their abstaining from Commerce or Communication with the Gentile World. And 4thly, The Nature and Genius of the Language, and other Reasons that need not be mentioned.

But

But in reality there was not *Time enough* for the supposed *natural Frailty* of Language to take Place in, during the Life of one Man, the common Parent of that Branch of the People of God, by which the *Hebrew* was preserved, and transmitted down to *Abraham*.

I am not now contending that *Hebrew* was the primæval Tongue, so much, as that the primæval Tongue must come uncorrupted to *Shem*, and so to his family through *Arphaxad* to *Terah* and *Abraham*; because there was not Time for any material Alterations to creep in, if other Causes had not contributed to its Preservation. Suppose that *Henry I.* and *Henry VII.* had been Father and Son as *Shem* and *Abraham* were, and *Cotemporaries*, notwithstanding the intermediate Centuries, and the latter's Progenitors, would any Man have made any Doubt of their both speaking the same Language? We find that *Hebrew* retained its Integrity, not only in the Hands of Prophets from the *Exodus* to the Captivity, but also in the Mouths of Heathens from the *Dispersion* of the Nations to the *Exodus* of *Israel*, at which Time it was in its Purity in *Canaan*, for a Space of Time almost equal to that from the *Exodus* to the Captivity; and this without any of those peculiar Helps it had the Advantage of under the *Israelites* after their Settlement; and therefore no *natural Decay* could corrupt it during the Life of one

Man; and as for some few additional Words, or new coined ones, if made by Prophets, or judiciously formed, and sanctified by the prophetic Use of them, as those transmitted to us in the *Hebrew SS.* are, they will not affect the Inference from the Perfection of the *Hebrew Tongue*, supposing that the primæval, in the least. But it is straining hard for Objections, and striving *invitâ Minervâ*, to find out a Flaw in the holy Tongue, to infer, as this *Section of the Doctor's Antiquity* does in many Places, from a Supposition of some new Words creeping into the *Hebrew*. See p. 68, &c.

But I want at present to bring the first Language no further than *the Affair of Babel*, in such a Degree of Purity as to be stiled the same; and hope, the Considerations I have suggested in Reply to the Doctor's *full Consideration* of this Point, will, *so far*, weaken the Force of his reasoning, if not set it aside; and shall now proceed to the Affair of *Babel*, commonly called *The Confusion of Tongues*, and by Dr. Sharp, very often, *The Division of Tongues*; though neither *Tongue*, nor *Division of Tongues*, is once mentioned in the whole Account. And here I shall enquire first into the precise and strict Meaning of,

TONGUE,

TONGUE, לשון; and LIP, שפה.

The *Tongue* and the *Lips* are the principal Organs of Speech; and the two Words are also used in Scripture, and that, frequently, in a *metonymical*, as well as a metaphorical Sense, and are applied to any Thing of the same or the like Shape Form and Use. We use the Word *Tongue* in a metonymical Sense, but not *Lip*. *Tongue* with us is *Language*; but *Lip* signifies no more than the organal Part, or something in Shape and Use like it. All Ideas are given us, or are taken from Things that are the Objects of our Senses: We have none innate. All Parts of the Body almost afford *Names* in Scripture for the *natural* Ideas arising from them; the same Word that stands for the *organal* Part, being likewise used in a further Sense, as a Name for the Effect, Use or predominant Quality belonging to it; and we may reasonably expect, that this, which we call *metonymical*, Use of the Words, should be proper, and bear some Analogy to the Things, or Use of the Things, the Ideas are borrowed from: Without this, the Usage would be meerly arbitrary, and the Words unmeaning, or bearing no *Idea*, only Identity of Sound, put for two different Things, that have no Relation to, or Connection with each other, without Reason or Judgment.

We

We have some Instances of a proper metonymical Use of Words in the *English* Tongue, and Numbers in the *Hebrew*. *Hand*, *e. gr.* is that Part of the Body, and one who helps or assists us; a *Hand* is a Workman, one skilful and ready with his Hands. We put *Man* to *Foot*, to express one that goes on *Foot*, a *Footman*; and the Word has no further Meaning in our Tongue, except as it is used for a Measure supposed to be the Length of a Foot; whereas רגל in *Hebrew*, expresses in the same Letters, the *Foot* and *Footman*; as also the Design of going on the Foot, prying and spying with a busy, crafty or malicious View; so to calumniate, defame, 2 *Sam.* xix. 27. "He has slandered thy Servant." And *Pf.* xv. 3. "He backbiteth not with his Tongue." *Heb.* לא רגל על לשון, literally, "There is no Foot upon his Tongue;" no idle Story, which designing People foot, or slide, about to pick up.

עקב the *Heel*, is to supplant, or kick up the Heels; Treachery or Deceit; and Hire, Reward, or covert View, with which any Thing is done.

ברך the *Knee*, and to kneel; it is also to bless, Leigh says, "because the Knee is bent to receive the Blessing; as also when we salute or bow to a Person." We move forward by the Help of the Knee in walking; and Success, Progress and Blessing, are so nearly related in Meaning, that one would be apt

to think, the Word was borrowed from the Use of the Knee, as expressive of the Idea that ariseth from it. So קָנָה which is *to go*, is also *to bless*. *Verbum eundi Significationem Felicitatis habet in multis Linguis,* says Leigh.

כָּנָה is the *Bowels*, and *Compassion*; *Tenderness of Affection*. The Word is not appropriated to either Sex. It is also a young Person, from the Softness and Tenderness peculiar to Youth; and which is strongest and most amiable in the tender Sex.

לֵב the *Heart*; and it is used as largely and extensively in our Tongue, as in the *Hebrew*. It signifies that Organ itself, and the *Midst*; (it being in the *Midst* of the Body) which the Translators seem not to have thought of, when they rendered *Job* i. 5. as they have done, "It may be my Sons have sinned, and *curst* God in their *Hearts*." Whereas literally it is, "It may be my Sons have sinned, and *blessed* the Gods in the Heart of *them*," *i. e.* amongst them; for Idolatry was pretty far spread at that Time. As the *Heart* is the *Middle* or *Midst*, so it is used also for what is seated in the Heart, *Wisdom*, *Courage*, *Resolution*, and so forth, *per Synecdochen*, or because the Word *Heart*, to them who consider what the Heart is, and performs in the Body, suggests these several Ideas, and one or other more particularly according to the Context.

חֶסֶד the *Breast*, is also to *see, contemplate, reflect*, as when we turn our eyes inward, look into the Breast and ruminatē.

סֶמֶל the *Shoulder*, and *metaphorically*, a Portion of Land lying upon the Borders or Confines of it; the not observing of which, has obscured that celebrated Prophecy of *Moses*, relating to the Place God would chuse to put his Name in for ever, *Deut. xxxiii. 12.* " of *Benjamin* he said, the Beloved of the Lord " shall dwell in Safety by him, *covering over* " *him for ever*; and he shall dwell *between* " *his Shoulders*," i. e. just within the *Confines* of that Tribe, or on the Borders of it. *Judah* was to continue a Tribe, with a jurisdictional Power, their Judges, as seated on the Bench of Justice holding their Scepter or Staff of Power between their Feet till *Christ* came. And though *Judah* only should retain such a Jurisdiction of all the Tribes, when the *Messiah* came, yet *Benjamin* should be protected by the Temple and Ark of God, for ever, or as long as *Judah* should. But to return: The *Shoulder* of the Body, is *metaphorically* the Shoulder of a Country; and *metonymically*, *Consent*, because *setting the Shoulder* is joining in performing of a Work.

יָד the *Hand*, is also the Power or Means of acting. Any Thing in Form or Use like the Hand, any Thing we use as a Handle. I do not remember that it is used for a *Person*, as *Hand* is in *English*. But,

כַּדָּ the *Elbow*, or *Arm* from the *Elbow* downward, is a *Maid Servant* in *Hebrew*; her Work lying upon the *Elbows*, as a *Porter's* does upon his *Shoulders*; and an *Artificer's* upon his *Hands*; or *Footman's* upon his *Feet*. So the *Hebrews* used *Elbow*, as we use *Hand*; and as they used *Foot*, as a personal Name.

זַרְעוֹ is *Arm*, and *Seed*; the latter, I suppose from that which the *Seed* shoots out, which is like an *Arm* projected from its body. *Arm* is also *Strength*, *Assistance*, exerted *Power*. *The Arm of the Lord*; of the mighty; a strong *Hand*, and stretched-out *Arm*, are Expressions that convey their own Meaning in better Language than any Comment can do, and the Propriety and Expressiveness consist in the Connection betwixt the *Arm*, *Strength* and *Assistance*, or *Power* exerted, whether to support or oppress.

חֵם the *Nose*, is *Heat*, *Anger*. "It signifies three Things, says *Calassio*, the *Nose*, *Anger* and *Face*, being the most prominent Part of the *Face*." It signifies also to *bake*, or heat Things in an *Oven*. It is construed also, to *surround*; as *Psal. xviii. 5.* "The Sorrows of Death אֶפְרוֹי (suppose we construe it) put me in a *Heat*, i. e. terrified me, as *Jonah* says, to the very *Soul*." *Terror* and *Consternation* have this Effect upon the Body, as חֵם is *Anger*, because the *Heat* is in the *Nose* in *Anger*, the *Hebrew* uses long and short, with the *Nostrils*, the two *Ovens* or *Spiracula*

Spiracula of the angry Heat, metonymically; and *Leigh* observes the great Propriety of the Expressions, because those who have long Noses, or "widest Nostrils are usually most "patient, as those who have narrow Nostrils "are hasty." Anger has an Effect upon the Shape of the Nose for the Time, swells and contracts the Nostrils. And so long or short nosed, is good Sense, though not good *English*, for a patient or a hasty Man. *Leigh's* judicious Observation may be extended to other Parts of the Body, as to the Shoulders, Neck, or Head, which by their Make indicate the Temper and Disposition of People. ננ has been supposed to be the Root of נא, *cum defectu* "Nun, but by what Rule the Nun should be deficient, has not been shewn. It expresses another Effect of Anger as a Verb, *Spiravit, flavit naribus*; Animals snort and blow with their Nose, when moved or disturbed; and so do People in Anger, and perhaps that blowing and snuffing of the Nose may increase the Heat there. However, the Heat and blowing of the Nose, are two distinct Things; and why should not נא and ננ be deemed distinct Roots, when their Radicals are so? The Versions seem to have missed the Sense of *Psal. lx. 3.* אַנְפַּת תְּשׁוּבָה, rendered by *Pagn. exacerbatas as, reverteris*, which the *English* paraphrases, "thou hast shewed thy "People hard Things." Whereas, שׁוּב is only another Word for the blowing of the Nose,

Nose, as in Anger, for the Air goes and returns, as a Wave does in blowing.

A Language formed upon a metonymical Plan, by one who understood Nature, as the Author of the *Hebrew Tongue* did, is what the *H——ns* call an *ideal Language*. I may observe here, that *Hebrew* must have God for its Author, whether it be that which he himself taught *Adam* to speak, or it be only a Vessel built upon one of the Planks that swam ashore, when the Ark of God run foul upon the Rock of *Babel*, and wracked, as the (modern) Learned say, if I may speak in their Phraseology, the *Hebrew Tongue*, is. In this Case, *Hebrew* as well as all the other Tongues, inspired into Men, at that strange and incredible Shipwreck, must be a Language of God, of his Forming for Men, and inspiring into them : For he did not strike them dumb, on these Gentlemen's Plan, obliterate all Words out of their Mind, and leave them to get others as they could ; but he *confounded one Language into many*, if such a Way of Speaking be not a Contradiction in Terms. They were all then of God's own Forming, and we may naturally imagine that so wise an Architect would build with Skill and Judgment. The Instances abovementioned, shew the Compiler of the *Hebrew Vocabulary*, had some Regard to the Connection of Ideas, and natural Relations between Things ; and when we understand Nature better, the *Sameness of*
Idea

Idea in many Words, may appear ; which at present, or to one who is resolved not to see it, much less to study for it, may seem a Riddle that has no Key to it.

But it is only *לשון* and *שפה*, I propose to examine into at present, to determine, if it can be done, their precise Meaning, either *literally* or *metonymically*. I pass by their *metaphorical* Usage, because there has not been, as indeed there is but little Room for any Dispute on that Head. The Organs or organal Parts of the Body they stand for, are out of Dispute, the *Tongue* and *Lips*. I do not know that the Learned have attempted the Derivation of either of these Nouns, and so I may do it without Offence, or fear of being charged with Want of Deference to any great Man. I would make *לש* the Root or Verb to the Noun, *לשון*. It signifies to *temper*, *mix*, *knead*, as Dough or Mortar are mixed up and tempered. 1 *Sam.* xxviii. 24. "The Woman took Flower and *לשנה* kneaded it." This is the Use of the Tongue in eating, it turns about backwards and forwards, up and down what we chew. And it has the like Use in forming articulate Sounds, without it the Mouth could make no Distinction of Sounds ; nor can the Tongue without the Ear. One born dumb will never speak. The Office of the Tongue is only to make Sounds, or rather to temper and prepare the Air, and protrude it to be emitted in Voice. It is an absolutely necessarily

necessary Instrument of Speech, but its Office is confined within the Mouth; and there is something further still necessary to qualify us to *utter* our Words, and deliver out what we would say; and this is the Office of the Lips; by them the Sounds made by the Tongue, or the Air tempered and prepared by it, are *broke* into Words and Sentences, and delivered out. The Teeth assist both the Tongue and Lips in their respective Offices; but the Lips split and divide, or break the Air which the Tongue prepares and protrudes to them, and so they utter it in Words and Sentences.

As the Root of לשון Tongue, expresses its Use, so does the Verb שוף or שפה this Use of the Lips in Speech. The Verb signifies to *crush*, to *break to Pieces* by crushing and squeezing. Calaf. שפה *Contusio, & Contritio.* שוף *contudit, contrivit.* Gen. iii. 15. speaking to the Serpent, "He (the Son of God, I say *Son of God*, because such *the Seed of the Woman*, which supposes no human Father, must be: He would have been the Seed of the Man, had he had a human Father. So that the Expression, *the Seed of the Woman*, is directly the same as ours of *the Son of the Virgin* taken literally; and *mystically*, the Seed of the Woman is the Sons of God by the Church.) "shall bruise thy Head;" shall crush it to Pieces, as the Head of a Serpent is by a Foot that treads upon it. Job xxxiii. 21. "His Flesh is consumed away that it cannot

“ be seen; and his Bones שֶׁפָּו, *Pagn. con-*
 “ *fringentur, are broke to pieces;* לֹא רָאוּ
 “ they are not perceived,” or unperceived.
 His Flesh wastes insensibly, and his Bones (as
 Things that consume and rot away) *are worn*
to pieces imperceptibly. The Lips squeeze
 and push out the Breath in Sounds, in proper
Breaks and Pieces. שֶׁפָּי as a Noun, and
 נִשְׁפָּה a Participle, are differently construed,
 by *contritus, sublatus, præruptus, editus;*
 they are spoke of craggy Rocks and Precipices,
 the high Grounds, whence other Grounds
 have been broken and torn off; such are the
 highest Grounds, and mostly rocky, without
 which, they could not have resisted the Force
 of the returning Water, and stood, when the
 adjacent Grounds were torn away. The *La-*
tins used the Word *præruptus* in the same
 Sense for craggy Rocks and steep Places.
 שְׁפֹת בָּקָר is once used for some Sort of Pro-
 visions brought to *David* in the Wilderness,
 and rendered *Cheese of Kine;* but perhaps
 was Flesh of Kine, or Beef, prepared in such
 a Manner as we call *potted,* by beating and
 bruising; or in Pieces, by which the Flesh was
 brought ready drest, and fit to keep. שֶׁפִּי is a
 Serpent that lodges in Cracks and Crevices of
 the Ground, or haunteth the Rocks and steep
 Places. If this is the Sense of the Verb שֶׁפָּה,
 and the Office of the Lips be to divide, sepa-
 rate, articulate, or break into proper and dis-
 tinct Sounds or Words, the Breath or Air, by
 the

the Help of the Tongue, this Work points out the Root of שפה *Lip*, to be that of שפף to squeeze and break into Pieces. It is a Question whether we could learn to speak without the Lips; but without Question the Lips are the chief and principal Organ in articulating and uttering the Voice. And we may reasonably expect, that a judicious and intelligent Person would have a proper Regard to the distinct Offices and Uses of the Tongue and Lips in his *metonymical* Usage of the Words; and not confound what Nature has made so different. No Writer or Speaker can do it, in this or any other Case, without being confused, obscure and ill understood. We find *Tongue* and *Lip* in *Hebrew* frequently used in a further Sense, than for the meer organal Parts, as we call it *metonymically* or *figuratively*. If the Metonymy be proper and the Figure true, it must be taken from the Nature and Office of these Organs, and *this* Sense be as distinct as *their* Use. The Tongue forms the Sound, the Lips form and *deliver* our Words; so *Tongue* should be what it forms, *viz.* Language; and *Lip* what is delivered out, *viz.* our Sentiment; or what is expressed by Words, Design, Opinion, Counsel, Confession, or what we profess to think and believe. The Lips, as I said, form Words, so as to make them expressive of our Sentiments in a rational Way; not as the Lips of the Brutes do their several Voices, though in-

S 2

telligibly

telligibly to each other, yet not rationally and *discoursively*. So that the Tongue being appropriated to the arbitrary Sound or Name of a Thing, and the Office of the Lips to *reasoning* or the *Sentiments* of the Mind; to Words, not as they are arbitrary Names or meer Sounds, as those formed by the *Tongue* alone are, *Lip* cannot properly be *Language*, nor *Tongue* any Thing else but *Noise* or *Language*, in a metonymical Application of the Words.

But as *Creation is the Ground-Work of Revelation*, or *Hebrew the Creation subsisting in Sound*, let us consult the *Hebrew SS.* for the Usage and Meaning of these Words, for that Language, in the Hands of the Prophets, as it is, will point out, I apprehend, many Times, the Nature of Things, that would otherwise escape us.

“ *Tongue*, says *Calassio*, is that Organ properly; metonymically, Speech or Language; then Difference of Speech or Language.” That is, it is Language in general; neither this nor that particular Language, but Language only as it relates to *Sound* or *Voice*; “metaphorically, any Thing of the Shape of a Tongue; lastly, an evil Tongue, evil speaking, Slander and Calumny;” which latter Sense arises from the *Tongue*, as in quarrelling and making a Noise at People, or *betonguing* them; and in this Sense is מלשון used, *Pf. ci. 5.* and is construed *obloquentem*, being a Participle from the

the Noun *Tongue*. " They who betongue
 " or abuse their Neighbour in private, them
 " will I cut off." We have other Instances
 of forming a Verb from a Noun, taking the
 Idea from the Noun. *Gen. xiii. 9.* " If thou
 " wilt *right-hand* it, I will *left-hand*; if
 " thou wilt *right-hand*, then I will *left-*
 " *hand*." And so *שׁוּב* may be from *שׁוּב*
 the Tongue, and that from *שׁוּב*, which ex-
 presses the Use of the Tongue; the Tongue
 only is employed, as it were, the Haste and
 Heat which such Noise ariseth from, not giv-
 ing the Lips Time to perform their Office,
 and you hear little else but Noise. About the
 Meaning of *Tongue* in the several Applications
 of the Word, there is no Dispute nor Confu-
 sion. *Tongue* is used in *Hebrew* in a further
 Sense than Language, if it be a further Sense,
viz. in the same Sense, we use Language for
 the Style or Diction; as we say, the Language
 of such a Writer is good or bad, elegant, low,
 or the like, respecting his Choice of Words
 and Manner of composing. A *flattering*, de-
 ceitful, false and crafty Tongue, or the
 Tongue of the Learned, of the Crafty, and so
 on, are spoke with Relation to their Diction
 and Choice of Words, and Manner of expres-
 sing themselves. *Prov. xv. 2.* " The Tongue of
 " the Wise *תִּישִׁיב* (not properly translated)
 " *useth Knowledge aright*;" but *makes it* good
 again, renews or supports it; as the Lamps in
 the Temple were *made good* every Morning
 S 3 by

by *Aaron's* supplying them with fresh Oil. We might render it *revives Knowledge*. And *Tongue* here is the Organ of Speech, which the Wise use to increase Knowledge, and stir up Wisdom with, without interfering with the *Lip*, in its Sense and Usage: Which I shall now proceed to.

שפה, "The Lip (says *Calassio*) of Man, "metonymically, *Tongue*, Speech, Faculty of "speaking, *Oratio, Sermo*." If this be right, and both *Lip* and *Tongue* be *Language*, why not call these Organs themselves indifferently by the same Name? And the same Confusion that would arise from using the same Word both for the Lips and Tongue in a literal Sense, must attend the promiscuous Usage of them in a metonymical one. The Former of a Language that should call the *Head* and *Feet*, or Hands and Eyes by the same Name, would be justly taxable with Want of Sense and Discretion: And is it not the same Case as calling the *Tongue* and *Lips* by the same Name? But I apprehend the SS. are not so ambiguous in the Use of Words; and am at present so far convinced of it, that I am here ready to oblige my good Friends, Messieurs *Kalmar* and *Sharp*, and fight about it. Though as this Part of my present Design obliges me to re-examine some Texts that are brought on the opposite Side by a Man of Integrity, open honest Heart, and becoming Zeal, who proposeth his Sentiments

timents like a *Christian* who is in earnest about his Religion, and feels the Power of it in a due Influence over his angry Passions, I shall have no Occasion to fight or wrangle. Here are no Mazes or serpentine Windings to pursue a sophistical Wrangler through; he neither counterfeits nor dissembles; he seems to follow the Truth for the Sake of Truth; and yet (I am sure of his Pardon for speaking my own Sentiments without Reserve) I can by no Means agree with him, either in his Critic on שפה, or in the general Method he has dropt into of splitting and dividing *Roots*, and making one radical Word a Compound of several; which, besides its leading us into a wide Wood, without Guide or Direction how to get out again, or proceed onward, destroys all simple Ideas, and leads us on in an endless Chace after the imaginary component Parts of an Idea. There can be no Rule in such an Enquiry to go by. It is a Ship without Compass or Rudder; Fancy fills the Sails, and the Wind of Imagination hurries it about where it listeth. If the *three* Letters of a Word be *radical*, and have one Meaning fixed to them, is it not making *Serviles* of one or more of them, when we divide or construe them as *Serviles*? And is not that changing the *Nature* of the Letters in that Word? Compound Names may, and must be resolved into their component Parts to come at their Meaning; but the Meaning of *radical* Words

is to be got by looking at the *Thing*, or *Things*, they are substituted for. But to return.

The Meaning of שפה *Lip*, I would fetch from the Organ, and Use or Office of that Organ; and its Office so plainly relates to *Sentiment*, and it is so frequently used to that Purpose, that few drop that (Part of its) Sense in their Definition of it; though the Notion of its signifying *Language* too is so general, that they intermix the *vulgar Error* with their Construction of Passages where the Word occurs. So Cocceius, Gen. xi. 1. " *Et erat tota terra שפה אחת labium unum & verba una.* Una Dialecto utebantur omnes, & idem sensus erat in omnibus, μαγνη. Idem loquebantur. De nulla re inter se concertabant." That is, *They had the same Language, and were all in the same Sentiment. One Opinion. They spoke all the same Thing, and differed in nothing.* And so others generally slide *Language*, which belongs to the Tongue, in with *Lip*, whose Office is not to make Sound but Sense. And one would think the same Word could not signify *both* in the same Place. And *Language* has nothing to do with the *Sentiment*: People of different Languages may, and do, agree in their Opinions; as People of the same Tongue may disagree in their Opinions. If the *Earth* being all of one *Lip*, mean as Cocceius explains it first, being all of one *Language*, what has that to do with their Sentiments or Opinions, which

which the latter Part of his Paraphrase, *viz.* *idem sensus* and *μιασμα*, gives as a certain Construction of the Words? And if *one Lip* be a *Uniformity of Opinion*, what is the *one Dialect* or *Language* put for? The *verba una* or *same Words* is paraphrased by his *idem loquebantur*, which they might do without speaking in the same Language. And so Mr. Holloway on this Verse, "God would con-
 " found their *Language*, and with that their
 " *Talk* or *Religion*, and *Philosophy* also." And to the same Purpose he paraphrases the sixth Verse, "The People is one, and they
 " have all one *Language*, (Heb. *Lip*) that is,
 " besides their being united in the original
 " *Language*, they were confederated as the
 " Psalmist expresses it, in an *evil Word* or
 " *Speech*, Ps. lxxiv. 5. and as the Prophet—
 " Every Mouth speaketh Folly. Letter and
 " Spirit, p. 110 and 114." If *Lip* here be the *evil Word* or *Speech*, or the *Folly*, what stands for the *original Language*? Or if *Lip* be the *original Language*, what is there to be rendered an *evil Word*? *Lip* cannot signify the *original Language* and *evil Word* both in this more than in the first Verse.

Saying and *Meaning* are in all Languages of the same Import; and it is the Office of the *Lips* to say or utter. Let us cite a few Texts for their Relation to *Sentiment*.

Job xi. 2. "Shall a Man of *Lips* be justified?" It cannot mean a Man who can talk two

Lan-

Languages, or is Master of two Manners of Pronunciation; for what has the Difference of Dialects to do with Justification? It means a Man who is *unstable, wavering* in his Faith, will not be justified.

Chap. xii. 20. "He removeth away the "*Lip of the Faithful*, and taketh away the "*Understanding of the Aged*." It does not mean, we may presume, that God taketh away the *Language* or the Manner of their Pronunciation from the Faithful or Trusty, *i. e.* of those who think themselves so, or pretend to be such; but that he confounds their Devices.

Pf. xii. 5. "Our *Lips* are our own; who is "Lord over us?" Not, we will speak in what Tongue we please, and pronounce our Words as this or that Nation does, according to our own Pleasure; who shall control us? But we will profess what Sentiments we please; who is Lord over us?

Pf. lxxxi 6. "This he ordained in *Joseph* "for a Testimony, when he went out of the "Land of *Ægypt*. I heard a *Lip* that I "knew not. I removed his Shoulder from "the Burden." It is God is the Speaker. No Language could be unknown to him. Mr. *Holloway* has pressed this Text into his Service, as a Proof of a Difference between the *Hebrew* and *Ægyptian* at *Joseph's* going into *Ægypt*. But there are two material Points, which some how or other have escaped that
learned

learned Gentleman; and which, had he attended to, he could never have construed *Lip* to be *Tongue* in this Place. 1st, That it is God who is the Speaker; and no Language can be unknown to him. And that 2^{dly}, Supposing it spoke of *Joseph*, i. e. the People of *Joseph*; it is at their coming out of *Ægypt*, they heard *this Lip* they did not know. Had the *Ægyptian* Language been different from their's at their going down, it could be no strange Language, or a Language they did not know, at their coming out above two hundred Years afterwards. Now it is certain, it was the *false Confession* of *Ægypt* that God interposed to rescue them from. *Who is Jehovah?* *I know not Jehovah*, says *Pharoah*. This was a Lip or Words God would not hear. He did not know it for a Reality; and is spoke in the same Sense our Lord speaks to the Wicked: *Depart from me, I know ye not.* *

Pf. cxl. 3. "Adder's Poison is under their *" Lips."* The Venom of the Wicked is not in their *Language* or Pronunciation, but in their Sentiments and Devices.

Isaiab vi. 5, 7, 9. "A Man of *unclean Lips*;
 "and I dwell in the Midst of a People
 "of *unclean Lips*——this hath touched thy
 "Lips, and thine Iniquity is taken away."
 The *unclean Lips*, we see, were *Iniquity*; and such an Epithet is used with *Lips*, as if the Prophet had been speaking only of the Lips of his Mouth; and their being cleansed, is tak-
 ing

* Or, acknowledge you not.

ing away the Pollution he had contracted by dwelling among a People polluted with wicked Thoughts and evil Devices; whose Words and Sentiments must frequently come through his Lips, when he reproved them for them.

Ch. xix. 18. "Speak the *Lip of Canaan*, and swear to the Lord of Hosts."

Lam. iii. 62. "Thou hast heard their Reproach, O Lord; all their Imaginations are against me; The *Lips* of those that rose up against me, and their Devices are against me all the Day." He does not complain of their *Lips*, with respect to their different *Dialect*; but their idolatrous Malice and Enmity, the Effects of their corrupted Faith.

Hos. xiv. 3. "We will render the Calves of our Lips." This is rendered, *Heb. xiii.*

15. "The Fruit of Lips, confessing to his Name." *Cocceius, Labia nostra, confessionem nostram.* And so the Jews, it is well known, understand it in their private Writings.

Zeph. iii. 9. "I will turn to the People a pure Lip, that they may all call upon the Name of the Lord, to serve him with one (Heb. Shoulder i. e.) Consent." A pure Lip cannot mean a clean Mouth; nor can it be *Language* here, or Manner of Pronunciation; but Confession or right Sentiments in Religion, that all might unite in the Worship of the true God.

As

As a People of *unclean Lips* is a People polluted with false and filthy Tenets in Religion, in *Isaiab* cited above, and a *clean Lip* is a *pure Religion*, in the last Text; so *stammering Lips* mean a false and lying Religion; and so the Old and New-Testament both call the *Idolatry* of the Heathen a *Lie*. As *Isaiab* xxviii. 11. "With *stammering Lips* and another *Tongue* will he speak to this People. "To whom he said, This is the Rest where- with ye may cause the Weary to rest, and this is the refreshing; yet לא אבוא I could not bring or induce them to Obedience." The Prophet is threatening *Ephraim* or the Kingdom of *Israel* with Captivity, for refusing to hear the clear, plain and faithful Advice of God; and tells them, that they should be made to hear a People whose Tongue they should not understand, and whose Lip should be a lying, or stammering and false one: For *stammering* is a proper metonymical Epithet with Lips here; for they as naturally quiver, and the Tongue falters, in telling a Lie, or a dark blind Story, as the Eyes stare in a Fright; or the Tongue shoots and darts in hasty and passionate talking; or the Nose heats in Anger; or the Ears *unfold* in listening. *Isaiab* couples together, because they went together, in this Case, these *lying Lips* and *another Tongue*. We must adapt the Word *stammering* to the metonymical Sense of *Lips* in this Text as we do in the other above

bove cited. To *besitate*, *blunder* and *stammer* are the same Thing in Nature. It is evident from the Context, that *Isaiab* is speaking of the Captivity of *Israel* and *Judah*; and so the People of another Tongue and *stammering Lips*, must be the *Syrians* and *Chaldeans*, whose Tongue was then different from the *Hebrew*, but who were no *Stammerers* as to Tongue or Pronunciation that we know of. *Rabshekeh*, when before the Walls of *Jerusalem*, seems to have had no Impediment in his Speech: But their Religion was a *Lie*; and he and his Master soon faltered there, when they came to the Proof.

Mr. *Holloway* does readily acknowledge, that Lip "is often and eminently used for religious Discourse or Confessions," p. 120. Letter and Spirit. Whether Dr. *Sharp* will acknowledge as much I do not know; nor what his real Sentiments are of that Passage of SS. which has given Ground for the Notion of a sudden and miraculous Multiplicity of Languages; for that learned Gentleman can affirm and deny, defend or oppose, this or that Side of a Question, without declaring his own Sentiments about it. He thinks, he says, that Mr. *Holloway* has sufficiently confuted Mr. *H—n's* hasty Criticism on *Lip*, and refers Mr. *Moody* and myself to that Confutation; with what View it is easy to discern. The Doctor laughs in his Sleeve, but generally titters so loud, that he spoils his Jest;

Jest ; he compliments Mr. H—y for his Ingenuity, and he is in the Right of it, for a more ingenuous Mind will not soon be met with. The Doctor is in Hopes that this *commendable Example* will induce others to think differently from what they do in this and other Points of the new Hypothesis. And so he leaves the Argument as stated by Mr. H—n, without even so much as glancing at it, except perhaps in one Place or two. Not so much as a Fling, nay not a Laugh, at any of the collateral Evidence in Support of the *No-Confusion of Tongues at Babel* ; his View in his *Antiquity of the Hebrew Tongue*, being the officious Honour of defending a Man, not less eminent for his Learning, than his Station in the Church.

And now my ingenuous and good Friend Mr. H——y, a few more Words with you. And I do with great Pleasure, enter on this Point, with one, who justly deserves the Compliment, though suspiciously, considering the Occasion given him by Dr. Sharp.

“ Lip when used for Voice, the Indication
“ of the Mind, says Mr. H——n, is never
“ once used in the Bible, in any other Sense
“ than for *Confession*.”

Mr. H——y, says, p. 120.

“ —This is not all ; for the Phrases, *other
“ Lips and other Tongues*, are also used for
“ *other Languages*, and other Utterances,
“ *Pronunciations or Dialects*.”

But

But *Pronunciations* and *Utterances*, are quite different Things from *Languages* and *Dialects*, and differ as much as the two Organs they belong to do. The *Tongue* is properly *Language*, and the *Lips*, as they utter what we say or mean, *should be* what we say or utter, which is our Sentiment, Opinion, Judgment, or *Counsel*. But to distinguish as Mr. H—y does in the next Page. That,

“ Tongues—express different Kinds of
 “ Speech as to the Signification of Words in
 “ the several Languages; and *Lips* the different
 “ Manner of Utterance as to Pronunciation.” Still a different Pronunciation, supposing that the Sense of *Lip*, does not make a different Language; and the Lips in the Text of *Isaiah*, stiled *Stammering*, will not relate to the Voice, as the Indication of the Mind, but to the Manner of pronouncing the Words; it calls those Lips, *stammering* or *drawling*, from some Imperfection, rendering them incapable of performing their Office in a regular Manner; and the Phrase must be either *literal* or *metonymical*. If the *first*; I say the *Stammerer* does not speak another Language, because he stammers; nor is *Stammering* a necessary Effect, or the Effect at all of a Diversity of Languages; or could *Stammering* produce, or occasion the Production of different Languages. The *Stammerer* speaks with Pain, and it is with Difficulty he is understood: But this Defect in the Organ neither arises from, nor occasions

occasions any Difference in the Language of the Stammerer, nor should one be supposed as the Cause or Effect of the other. Had the divine Power altered all the Lips of the Projectors at *Babel* instantaneously, that not one of them could speak plain, at least without *Tremblings* and *Distortions* of the Lips, it might indeed have set them a staring at one another; and if each had taken it into his Head that the other mocked him, it might have occasioned Fighting and Confusion enough; but no other Confusion, that is none in the Meaning of their Words, when they had stuttered them out; we must observe that the *Tongue* is not mentioned in the whole Account of the Confusion at *Babel*; and *Lips* it is here contended, signify the *Pronunciation*.

Of whom does *Isaiab* speak, when he says, *with stammering Lips and another Tongue will he speak to this People?* "The Apostle, " 1 Cor. xiv. 21. refers it most apparently to "the Gift of divers Languages," says Mr. H—y. But did the Apostles speak with *stammering Lips*, or *ridiculous Tremblings and Distortions of their Lips*? Or did *Greek* or *Latin*, the *Chaldee* or *Syriac*, or any other Tongue we know any Thing of, require such stammering or stuttering to get their Words out? We know of no such Curse upon these Tongues; or any Defect in the Organs of the Speech of these or any other People, more than there was among the *Israelites*. *Moses* had himself an

T

Im-

Impediment in his Speech. He was *by* rendered *uncircumcised*, i. e. thick, superfluous, protuberant, deep in his Lips, and *heavy* both of Mouth and Tongue; Stammering and such Impediments no more belong to one Language than another. The different Languages God spoke to his People of *Israel* by, or rather the different Nations of the World by, at the Gift of Tongues, were as polite and elegant, i. e. smooth and as soft as any Language whatever. We know not how *Hebrew* sounded to the Ear, or how smooth it run over the Tongue, whether *מַדְבָּרִים יְדֻכְּדוּ דֶּעַב אֲדֻמָּה*, or no; but we have a great deal of Reason to think that several other Tongues included under "the opprobrious Diversity of foreign or barbarous Languages," were of this mellifluous Kind. *Greek*, the principal one of those barbarous Languages God spoke to Mankind by, after the Day of *Pentecost*, was fluent and harmonious, and the Apostles, we have no Reason to think, *stammered* in delivering themselves.

There are several wrong Steps in this Inference from the Words of *Isaiab*, referred to by *St. Paul*; both the Prophet and Apostle distinguish the Lips and Tongue. Stammering does not alter one Language into another. Nor does one Language stutter more than another. There are scarce two Persons perhaps that pronounce their Words alike, and every different Language, it is true, differs also in its Pronunciation; but that makes no Difference in

in Language. Many of the Languages supposed to have sprung out of the Mud of the *Euphrates*; as Animals were formerly said to do, out of that of the *Nile*; were as soft and melodious, for ought appears to the contrary, as the *Hebrew* or any Language need be. Divers Languages and divers *Confessions* grew up together, both however were in being in *Isaiab's* Time. But *Isaiab* does not hint a Word in this Place, that either of them had a spontaneous, instantaneous or miraculous Origin at *Babel*, nor does he confound the Difference betwixt *Pronunciation* and *Language*; but, (if *Lip* be the *Manner of Pronunciation*) evidently distinguishes them. Languages differed in his Time, the *Jebudith* and *Aramith*, but so little that they are apparently near related, and the latter a Corruption from the other, as we may judge by its similar, but irregular Grammar; its similar but various Terminations, &c. and very probably its Pronunciation was different, but the *staminal* Words appear to have been the same, as far as we can judge, by what *Syriac* the Old-Testament has preserved. By that we see what the Language was, and of how wide a Spread, by its being the Language of *Babylon*, as well as *Nineveh*. And if *Stammering*, *Gabble* and *Gibberish* are not proper Epithets for it, then *Isaiab* must mean something else, by the *stammering Lips* of these God would talk to his People by, since they would not hear him.

And the Apostle cannot be supposed to *re-capitulate, cover and comprehend* the two *Expressions of stammering Lips and another Tongue* within the one Word *Tongues*, since they are two such different Things and have no necessary Relation or Connection with each other, much less with the *Gift of Tongues*. Nor does St. Paul so apply the Passage of *Isaiah*, as if the Prophet were there a predicting the miraculous Gift of Tongues, which is so manifestly contrary to the Scope of the Context, but only that God had threatened to speak to his *unbelieving People* by Men of another Tongue, as a Sign that their Punishment was from him ; and those Destroyers of God's Heritage might have also a different *Lip* or Confusion, and *bad* ; which the Apostle had no Occasion to re-capitulate, being only shewing that speaking with different *Tongues* was of no further Value than as it was a *Sign* to Unbelievers that understood them ; but of no Use to Believers or Unbelievers who did not.

A double Use is made of the next Text cited, *Letter and Spirit*, p. 121. viz. *Ezek. xxxvi. 3.*

" Ye are made to come upon the *Lip of the Tongue* and Reproach of the People," על שפת לשון ודבת. Mr. H—y paraphrases it,—

" Ye are become a By-Word even in the hea-
 " then Gabble or Gibberish, that is among the
 " babling Nations wherein ye are in Captivi-
 " ty." And the same Question will arise here as
 before, whether the Languages of the Hea-
 then

then are justly demonstrated *Gibberish*, or *Athens* or *Rome* may be said to *gabble*, as to Pronunciation, more than *Ur* of the *Chaldees* where *Heber* lived; or than *Jerusalem*. The *Margin* of our Bible renders it, "Ye are made to come upon the Lip of the *Tongue*," as the *Hebrew* stands: And it is *Tongue*, and not *Tongues*, in the Original. I confess I do not know what the *Lip of a Tongue* means, or if *Lip* be to be construed *Pronunciation*, as seems to be hinted, "Ye are made to come upon the Pronunciation of the *Tongues*." This would suppose there were several *Tongues* or *Nations*, that should have them in *Derision*, but no ways insinuates that those *Tongues* were *Gabble* or *Gibberish*. Nor is coming upon the *Pronunciation*, a very intelligible Phrase. But as *Tongue* signifies *Obliquy*, *Slander*, and רבת *Infamy*, or *By-Word*, the Sense would be plain, "Ye are made to hang upon the Lip, a *Subject for the Tongue*, i. e. the *Obliquy* and *By-Word* of the People." When People mock and deride others, they drawl their Words out, and keep them upon the Lip; so *stammer* is in *Hebrew* to mock. And this Passage only says, the Nations should have them in *Derision*, who should keep or hang their Names as a Proverb and *By-Word* upon their Lips, by Way of *Drollery*. Which drawling out of Words spoke in *Derision*, is not peculiar to any one Language, or any one People, but is as natural to *Derision*, as laughing

is to being pleased, or Haking or Stammering are to Hesitation and Perplexity. *It is plain from the Sense of this Passage, that the Jews should become, as they are at this very Day, a By-Word, and Subject of Derision to all Nations; mocked and drolled upon on all Occasions. And if hanging a Word, or keeping it upon the Lip, be natural in mocking, where is the Mark of Reference to the Babel-Confusion of Languages, which Mr. H—y would find in it? One Thing further, I might observe with Regard to this Text, as well as the former, and that which is to follow next; that is, that Mr. H—y and Doctor Sharp seem to forget, when they call the Language of the Nations, Babble, Gabble, and Gibberish, that they were not so according to their own Account, after God had reformed the universal Chaos of Babble that swallowed up the original Language, into Tongues again. So these Texts cannot call those Languages Gabble and Gibberish after it was made into Tongues; we may as well call the World a Chaos now, because it was made out of a Chaos.*

The Terror of God supposed to be upon the Spirits of the Projectors of Babel, from the Look of divine Wrath, like that at Sodom, would have effected their Eyes rather than their Lips; Terror certainly affects the Organs of Speech for the Time, but they recover when the Fright is over; and Mr. H—y supposes,

supposes, without any Authority from the Text, that the People at *Babel* had a *trembling* Lip, and *Hesitation* inflicted upon them, as to their *vocal Powers*; and that such *ridiculous drawling and lisping* continued till the *Descendants of Heber in Israel fell off to Idolatry*, p. 122. of which there is no Proof, and I believe I may say, no Authority in History to be found for it; and yet the Construction of these Texts, on which the Gentlemen lay their chief Stress, supposes the Fact. *Stammering Lips*, e. gr. if it means a *stammering Pronunciation*, and not, as I would understand the Phrase of a *lying or childish* Story, makes all who were under the *Confusion, Stammerers, Drawlers, Lispers*, or some how or other incapable of speaking plain.

And so does the next Text Dr. *Sharp* refers me to, viz. *Isaiah xxxiii. 19.* "Thou shalt not see a fierce People, of a deeper Speech than thou canst perceive; (*Heb.* of a deeper Lip than thou canst hear) of a stammering and ridiculous Tongue that thou canst not understand."

Mr. *H——y* supposes an Objector to say, that, "The Term *hearing* is never put for what we mean by *understanding* a Language," *Let. and Sp.* p. 124. I don't know where he will find this Objector; and I believe it is never put with *Voice* or *Language*, but in the Sense of understanding it,

because we do not hear a Word as a Word without understanding it, as *Isaiab xxxvi. 11.* besides those Places cited by Mr. H——y, “ Speak to thy Servants in the Syrian Language, for we hear, *i. e.* understand, it.” And this reconciles *Acts ix. 7.* “ Hearing *φωνή* a Noise,” and chap. xxii. 9. “ Heard “ not the Voice of him that spake.” They heard a Sound, but not the *Sound of the Speaker*; they heard the Speaker, but not what he said: Hearing what a Person says, implying you *understand* what he says. But to return to *Isaiab xxxiii. 19.* Suppose we understand it, as before, of a People, whose Notions should be too obscure and dark to be made Sense and Truth of; a People void of Truth and Understanding; such an one as is predicted, *Deut. xxxii. 21.* to be the Scourge of *Israel*. “ I will move them to Jealousy, “ with those which are not a People; I will “ provoke them to Anger, with a *foolish Nation*.” Such an one, as he who trusted in God, was not to see. “ Thou shalt not see a “ fierce People, of a deeper Lip than thou canst “ understand; of a stammering Tongue, (such “ as either Liars or Children have) *אין בינה* “ without understanding.” It seems to be the People that were without Understanding;— “ a fierce People, of thick Lips and stammering Tongue, without Understanding;” a weak and foolish People, whose Lip, or what they pretended to profess, was not to be un-

understood, from the Want of Sense, not Defect in their Language or Manner of Pronunciation. As I said before, we may accommodate *deep* and *faltering*, as we do *pure*, *polluted*, and other such Words, to *Lip*, in its figurative Sense of *Sentiment*; and it is only borrowing an Idea from a natural Defect in the Lip, as we do from the natural Use and Perfection of it; and is much easier than our metaphorical Way of speaking, when we apply *lame*, *dark* and *blind*, to a confused or false Story; and though every thick lip'd blubbering Stammerer is neither Fool nor Knave, yet such Defects in the Organs of Speech always carry the Appearance of Folly and Weakness with them; and a Liar very seldom tells his Story glibly, without hacking and Hesitation.

“ The Word *לשון* *Pf. cxiv. 1.* is spoken of “ the *Ægyptians* as a People of a *strange Lip*, “ or Language, to *Israel*,” say these Gentlemen. No; not *Lip* nor *Language*. It is spoken of the *Ægyptians* as a *barbarous* People; but neither the original or antient Translations say any Thing about *Lip* or *Tongue*; and *barbarous* is as applicable to *Manners* as *Languages*.

The Words are, “ When *Israel* went out “ of *Ægypt*; the House of *Jacob* from *לשון* “ *לשון* a *barbarous* People.” But whether in *Lip* and *Language* remains to be proved. The Word occurs no where else, *unless* *לשון* be

a *Servile*; and does not seem to have any Reference to *Language* and *strange*; because it would lay us under a very great Difficulty, to shew how a Language, they had been acquainted with above two hundred Years, could be called a strange Tongue to them. Construe *עַם לְעָוֹן*, *עַם* a People *לְעָוֹן* of *עַוְוָה* Violence, or become violent; and it would correspond with the Behaviour of the *Egyptians* to *Israel* exactly. They who have observed the Usage of *לְעָוֹן* as a *Servile*, know that Authority will justify this Construction. *Int. al.* see *Lam.* iv. 3. "The Daughter of my People *לְעָוֹן* is become cruel;" which is a direct parallel Instance. *2 Sam.* v. 2. "Thou shalt be *לְעָוֹן* a Captain." The Mistake about this Word may be as early as the *Chaldee* Paraphrase; but this Use of the *servile* *לְעָוֹן* is earlier; but that misled the later *Jews*, who chose to follow an arbitrary Construction against all Probability, or indeed Possibility, of its being right: Unless the *Chaldee* meant *barbarous* in our Sense of the Word, *cruel* and *violent*; and then the Mistake lays upon the later *Jewish* Writers. The *Lip*, mentioned *Pf.* lxxxi. 5. which, it is said, that God heard but did not know, must be spoke in the Sense of not knowing so as to approve of it, or which he would not acknowledge.

The general Tradition in the *East*, if such Tradition there be of sufficient Date, that *Peleg* was so named from the Dispersion of the Nations, by
the

the Division of Tongues, is not confirmed but contradicted by *Gen. x. 25.* "The Name of one was *Peleg*, because in his Days was the *Earth* (not *because Tongues were*) divided." No doubt the *Earth* was divided; but that says nothing of *Lips* or *Tongues*; and the Reason given for that Name of *Peleg* excludes the Division of Tongues out of its Etymology, because it assigns another Reason, viz. *the Division of the Earth*. It was God who determined the Bounds of their Habitations, and appointed each Family, or each Division and Subdivision, which Way they should steer, and where to settle; and we find, that many Colonies had actually gone off, and taken the Inheritance allotted them, when *Abraham* came into *Canaan*; and appear to have done so some Time before. *Canaan*, *Palestine*, *Aegypt*, and many other Countries, were found peopled, and Governments settled; and had as yet the Fear of God before their Eyes, as appears by *Pharoah's* and *Abimelech's* Behaviour, nay, and of the Children of *Heth* too, to *Abraham*; and though *Canaan* became four hundred Years afterwards ripe for Destruction, yet their Iniquity was not then full, when *Abraham* came among them; and though *Noah* predicted the future Wickedness of *Canaan*, and prophetically declared him accursed, yet there were others as wicked as he, and more wicked than his Posterity; as witness the earlier Destruction of *Sodom*, and their more

extraordinary Example, *suffering the Vengeance of eternal Fire.* The Earth was divided in the Days of *Peleg*, and before the Death of *Noah*; and this leaves upwards of two hundred Years for the Dispersion to take Place in; for so long *Peleg* lived. If the several Parties betook themselves to their several Colonies at once, and the Dispersion were not a Work of Time, which it is highly probable it was, as the Dispersion of the Tribes through *Canaan* was, though the whole Land was divided to them in one Day. The *dividing of the Earth*, must mean the allotting it out to the several Families, which might be done at the Birth of *Peleg*, and would naturally give Ground for the Name, if the Division was then settled, and in his Time would certainly take Place. All the Families of the Sons of *Noah*, mentioned *Gen. x.* must be in being when the Earth was divided to them, which they might be at the Birth of *Peleg*; and that *Division* might become the Epoch or *Date of Time* Mr. H——y speaks of. Or, the Interruption the Projectors at *Babel* met with, which made them desist from their Work, on which the principal Parties divided, that might be the Epoch, and Occasion of *Peleg's* Name; but here is no *Division of Tongues*, or any Thing like it, hinted at in this *Division of the Earth*, unless *Earth* means *Tongues*; and the Division of the

the Ground, or of the People, imply a Division of Tongues in it.

But Mr. H—y thinks, *Letter and Spirit*, p. 125. that, “ the sacred Oracles have also, “ under the *same Word*, alluded to the same “ Event. *Pf. lv. 9.* in particular refers to the “ *Means of the Division of the Nations*, by “ the *Division of Tongues* ; yea, and denounces a Curse, which is taken (in “ Terms) from *that* inflicted on the said “ most astonishing Occasion. *Swallow up, O “ Lord, and divide their Tongues.*” No ; not in Terms taken from that supposed Curse ; for neither *Tongues*, nor *dividing* them are mentioned in the whole Account : And *confounding*, or *mixing*, is the very Reverse of *dividing*. I have often considered the Text, and confess had no Idea of what *dividing a Tongue* meant, till this Method of splitting the Roots in *Hebrew*, gave me something to take an Idea from. If this were the Manner of the *Confusion at Babel*, it must necessarily lead to the same End it did then ; and swallow up the original Language in the same Gibberish it did there, and render it a *Chaos of universal Babble again* ; for that must be the Consequence of an arbitrary Division of *radical Words*. Mr. H—y explains the *Manner of the Confusion* from this Text, and Dr. Sharp seems particularly fond of it. “ 1st, The Substance of “ the one original Language was first *sunk*, “ and

" and as it were swallowed up in a vast *Chaos*
 " of *universal Babble*. 2dly, Out of that
 " Babble, or Jargon, it was again (by another
 " Act) divided, or broken, into many dif-
 " ferent Dialects or Tongues." The learned
 Gentlemen will pardon me, if I ask what it
 refers to?—It was again divided. What was?
 Not the *original Language* that was *sunk*,
swallowed up and gone. And it should have
 been said, the *Babble, or Jargon, was divided*
into many Tongues, by another Act, they say,
 meaning, it is to be supposed of God: But of
 that the Text does not say one Word; so that
 is *gratis dictum*. But suppose so; they should
 not talk of a *Division of Tongues*, it being,
 the very Reverse, a *Formation of Tongues*,
 not by dividing one, but by reducing a *Chaos*
 into regular Forms. Would it not be Non-
 sense to say, *the World was divided out of the*
Chaos? The *Chaos of Babble* was not *Language*,
 but *Jargon, Gibberish*; how then can
dividing their Tongue, which the Psalmist
 prays for in the *Translations*, allude to mo-
 delling a *Babble or Jargon*, which was no
 Tongue, into Tongues? The original *Language*
 was so far from being divided, that it
 was *swallowed up whole*, and a *Chaos of Babble*
 came, but how does not appear, in its Room;
 and in the Room of that *Chaos*, came many
flammering Lips, barbarous Languages, an
 opprobrious *Diversity of Dialects*, seemingly
 little better than the *chaotic Gibberish* they
 were

were the spawn of. Had the first Language been *sunk*, the People must have been all dumb; and could never have gabbled at all, much less, as some others have supposed, have gotten Languages for themselves in a few, or in many Days, for speaking is all Imitation. And if Nobody had had any Words, Nobody could have pronounced any to have taught others. These learned Gentlemen are not the only Persons that have laid a Stress in Writing on this Subject, upon Phrases that are confused, obscure and uncertain, and which rather contradict than prove what they aim at. They never state the Case, and tell you *precisely* what they mean by the *Confusion at Babel*, supposing it to relate to Language, but in such Terms or Phrases as are inconsistent with themselves, or with that very Evidence they would support that *Confusion* by.

Dr. *Sharp* cites this Passage of Mr. *H—y's*, in his *Antiquity*, p. 84, 85. and then says, “ Now if this was the Case, by what Evidence does it appear, *if one may presume to ask such a Question*, that the *Hebrew* might not have been one of those particular Dialects or Tongues, into which the one original Language was thus divided and broken.” The Answer to Mr. *H—y* will serve for the Doctor's Question. There was no original Language, on this Supposition, to be divided; *it was swallowed up and sunk*.—If the original Tongue was swallowed up, there could be no
 Roots

Roots or Words remaining, to be parcelled out to this or that People ; which takes off another Evasion of *Hebrew* being the *one Language*, (as is proved from the Names of Persons and Places being *Hebrew*, in so many Countries before and since the Flood.) There were no Fragments left of what was swallowed up whole. “ The *Confusion of Babel*, according “ to the Scripture Account of it,” — *i. e.* as Dr. *Sharp* understands the Account, was a Confusion or swallowing up of the *original Tongue*, p. 84, 85. and where will he find his Fragments of it ? It must be like *Jonah*, whole in the Whale’s Belly. And it is to be wished the Doctor would tell us how it came to hatch such a Nest of Tongues there. The Doctor is not arguing *ad hominem*, against Mr. *H—y* ; for he allows his to be the received Account of the *Confusion of Tongues*, (as the Affair of *Babel* is so improperly called by them, upon their own Hypothesis) and cites it with Approbation.

The Gentlemen seem to lay a Stress both of them, on the *Translation* of the Text, *viz.* *Psal.* lv. 9. — “ Swallow up, O Lord, and “ divide their *Tongues*.” The Commentator must take greater Liberties than the *Versions* have, to make Sense of these Words as they stand. As so great a Stress is laid upon them, and so much is supposed to be contained in the Expressions, as to *describe the very Manner of the Confusion*, the Reader will excuse my examining

amining the Text Word by Word. It is *Tongue*, not *Tongues* in the *Original*; nor is there any Thing to answer *and* in the *Versions*. We have no Dispute about *swallow up*; it means as much *destroying*, or taking Things away, as if they were swallowed up and devoured. The Word is applied to *Thoughts*, *Actions*, *Contrivances* and *Words*. " Their Wisdom is swallowed up." *Psal.* cvii. 27. and *Eccles.* x. 12. " The Lips of a Fool shall swallow him up." Not meaning the *Dialect* he speaks, or his Manner of Pronunciation, shall prove his own Destruction; but his own Counsel, Thoughts and Contrivances, shall lead him to his own Ruin. Which is most eminently true of *Imaginations in Religion*, they always confound themselves at long run, and all that embark in them, as the Project of *Babel* did. *נָחַל* rendered *divide* as a Verb, may be a *Noun*, a Stream, or Torrent, which is applied to Words or Language, a Torrent of ill Language, or of Noise and Abuse, is proper and common. Such was certainly poured out against that great Person, this *Psalms* relates to. And he prays that God would swallow up the Torrent or Stream of their Tongue against him.—" I would hasten my Escape from the windy Storm and Tempest. Swallow up, O Lord, the Torrent of their Tongue, for I see Violence and Strife in the City." This windy Storm and Tempest, Violence and Strife, might well be called a Torrent or

U

Stream;

Stream ; and of *their Tongue*, because it came from their Tongue. *Swallow up* and *divide* is an inverted Position of the Words, because that which was *swallowed up* and gone, could not remain to be divided. *Divide* and *swallow up* might be Sense, but the other can hardly be called so.

What other Proofs Mr. H—y may have in his Eye, from these or other Words, as he talks of some, I cannot say, and if I could guess, would examine them ; but I flatter myself, that a Man of his Candour and Ingenuity, will not think these, at least not all of them, on second Thoughts, so strong and convincing as he took them to be. He will distinguish betwixt *Pronunciation* and *Language*; and ask himself (which no doubt Dr. *Sharp* would have done, had he not been acting the Part of a meer Disputant, who forgot that a Christian would be in earnest when disputing about the Word of God) whether the heathen Nations were all *Stammerers*, literally, or, if any of that Variety of opprobrious Phrases (all extreamly proper in Mr. H—y's View of Things) used by him to the Languages of the Antients, were any of it proper or applicable to the Apostles, and the Tongues conferred on them on the Day of *Pentecost* ? And if a *Syrian* or an *Ægyptian*, a *Greek* or a *Roman*, and the Apostles, were not *Stammerers* in *Lip* and *Tongue*, more than a meer *Jew* ; or those Languages do not *distort* the Lip of the Speaker,

Speaker, more than the *Hebrew Tongue*; his Inference from the Words of *Isaiab*, cited by *St. Paul*, must fail; and *confounding the Lip of all the Earth*, cannot imply any Curse, or supernatural Distortion or disturbing of the Organs of their Speech; nor *Barbarism* of the Languages now supposed to have had an instantaneous, as well as divine Origin.

The other Proofs, are *manifest Misconstructions* of the Words of the several Texts; as the above, I take it, is a Mis-interpretation of the Sense of the Words.

Mr. H—y seems to suppose a Difference in *Lip*, i. e. in Pronunciation; one of the Things necessary to bring about a Dispersion. But surely the Storms of Heaven, or *rustling mighty Winds impelling them in a miraculous Manner*, and driving them the several Ways they were to go, (if there were any such made Use of) were sufficient to disperse them, without so stupendous and unnecessary a Miracle, as that of obliterating the Knowledge of one Language out of their Minds, and inspiring them with a Number of others. Great Ends of Providence have been answered by the multiplying of Languages; but there was no Occasion for a Miracle to do what would come about Time enough by natural Means, in the Course of God's ordinary Providence. As speaking is all Imitation, the Dispersion would naturally bring about a Difference in Pronunciation without any Miracle. And we may conclude

that the Difference in this Respect, was the Effect of the Dispersion; not the Dispersion of a Difference in Pronunciation.

Let us now suppose, that the Evidence for the Sense of שפה *Lip*, in what we call its metonymical Sense; is equal betwixt the *new Hypothesis*, and the old, as opposed by Mr. *H—n*, or betwixt his and the new Hypothesis of the late worthy Prelate, Dr. *Sharp* has the Honour of defending. I believe the most sanguine Opposer of Mr. *H—n*, will not deny but that *there is good Proof*, for his Sense of *Lip*, in some Places; we will suppose the Evidence equal, I say, betwixt Mr. *H—n* and his Opposers, as to the Sense of *Lip*, and examine the Context, *Gen. xi. 1—9.* to see which Sense of the Word that would lead us to, here; provided it were used in *two Senses*, in other Places. I shall observe, 1st. that Mr. *H—y* only attempts to prove that it signifies *Pronunciation*, and Dr. *Sharp*, who on this Occasion greatly applauds him, has not offered to produce one single Passage, where *Lip* is put for *Tongue*; and the Word *Tongue* is not mentioned in the whole Account, of the Affair of *Babel*, which is something very extraordinary, if it related to their Tongue. Tongue is the *proper* and *common* Word for Language, *Lip* being but very seldom understood, even according to these Gentlemen, in the Sense of *Pronunciation*, which is certainly different from *Language*; and it is something that re-
mains

mains to be accounted for, that the *proper Word* should not be used by an inspired Writer in the whole Account, so as to put his Meaning out of Dispute. But we are to suppose that *Lip* is *Pronunciation*, and *Pronunciation* equivalent to *Language*. Be it so. Even on this double Concession, the Evidence is equal betwixt Mr. H—n, and his Objectors.—The Word may be taken either Way, why is it immediately to be concluded then, as Dr. *Sharp* does, that his Construction of *Lip* by *Confession* in this Story, is *fundamentally* wrong? It may be wrong, if the Word is capable of both Constructions, or *it may be right*, and the Doctor is too hasty in his Conclusion. The bare Sense of the Word, indeed, will not determine the Point, if it be used, as he says, both Ways. But why must he conclude for his own Side of the Question, as absolutely certain, should the Word be used any where else in his Sense, where it may also, as is granted, be taken in the other Sense too? This is too sanguine for so cool a Disputant as Dr. *Sharp*.

But let us look into the Story, and see what *Lip* is spoke of in it; whether the *Manner* of *Pronouncing*, or *Project*. The Sons of *Noah* must know that God had preserved them from the Flood, to re-people the Earth, and consequently, that they must separate in Bodies, and occupy the Colonies allotted them; for had they all continued together, the same

Causes that prevent People multiplying too fast, and overstocking a Country, must have had the same Effect at *Babel then*, as at *Bagdad*, or any other great City, now. The Time the Dispersion was to take Place at, drawing nigh, at their pitching their Tents in the Plains of *Shinar*, some sensual People, who had a greater Influence over the Multitude, than they ought to have had, as their Passions had had over them, are for plotting Measures to prevent the Dispersion in Colonies that they might enjoy the Sweets of Ambition, by being at the Head of the whole People, and all the Pleasures of a large and populous City, preferable to the Rusticity of lonely Habitations, and the laborious Employment of cultivating desolate Countries, which must bring more Pleasure and Profit to their Descendants, than themselves. And the People being *all one* as yet, and their religious Polity of Course in the same Hands, as the Civil, they propose the Building a great City, and a strong Tower.—A great City, that they might all live happily together in, without going forth to War against the Elements, Famine, and the numberless Distresses of naked Colonies.—And a Tower, *not for a Check upon those who should oppose in Time, and prove refractory*, but for their God, whose Image they would set on the Top of it; and return Thanks to the God of Heaven, *through the Heavens*, by whom God sent his Blessings upon them; it being fit to honour the

the Servant by whom the Master visited them. *N. B.* They did not deny God at first, but worshipped him through the Heavens; then they said God walked in the Circuit of Heaven and did not, some said soon after, that he could not, *see* through the thick Darkness; and that he had left the World to itself. The next Step to which, was entirely forgetting him; but that was some Time first. The Proposal of a City, and its comfortable Conveniences, Pleasures and Diversions, took mightily; and they came in general, immediately into it. The Tower, and a God upon the Top of such a stately Building, had the Air of Grandeur and Piety. Not a fiery flying Serpent could glitter more, and the Bait was swallowed. They lay the Foundations of the City, build its Walls, and raise the lofty Top of its Tower to the Heavens, to whom, they set on the Summit, an Image of *Shem*, the *ruling Name*. This was the largest City the World ever saw yet, within Walls. The Attempt was advancing, when God saw it necessary to take some extraordinary Step to defeat the cursed Project. Ver. v. "The Lord came down to see *in his own Persons*, "the City and the Tower which the Children of Men builded. And the Lord said, "Behold the People is one,"—*One Body under the same Laws*, "and have all one Lip, "and this they begin to do: And now nothing will be restrained from them, which

“ they (can or will) imagine to do. Go to,
 “ let us go down, and there *confound their*
 “ *Lip, that one may not hear the Lip of an-*
 “ *other.*” The Complaint against them
 we see is for their *doing*, not their *Tongue*.
 “ This they begin to do. Now nothing will
 “ be restrained from them, that Imagination
 “ can prompt them to.” It is their Consent
 or Union in their diabolical Design, that God
 is mercifully apprehensive of for them, lest
 one Imagination bring on another; and they
 should all be unavoidably involved in the wick-
 ed Device of some Ringleaders, which as
 they were all one People, and *one Lip, Con-*
gregation, religious Community, or Church,
 having the same *Confession*, *Lip is Confession*,
 and the People who make that Confession;
 as *Tongue is Language*, and the People who
 speak it; so *all the Earth being one Lip*, is,
 that all were one religious Assembly, under
 the same spiritual Head, and having the same
 Creed, so were all *one Confession*; and the *same*
Words or *outward Expressions* of their Senti-
 ments, whether as to Prayers or Ceremonies,
 would necessarily follow. Had they had dif-
 ferent Tongues before, or soon after this apos-
 tatizing Step, they might still have joined to-
 gether in it, as so many different Nations often
 have in one common Cause. But what A-
 larms the good Providence of God, was, their
new Confession, “ this they begin to do, let us
 “ defeat the Execution of it.” What God
 came

came down to confound, was the *new Imagination*; and *Lip*, provided the Word will bear that Interpretation, must be that *Imagination* here.

But it is urged, that God *confounded their Lip or Tongue*, in order to defeat their *Lip or Confession*; or that he confounded their Project by confounding their Language; and their Language by dividing it. But the Text says no such Thing. It only says, according to their own Construction, that God confounded their Language; not a Word of his doing it by dividing their Tongue, or a Word about confounding their Lip or Imagination, (which alarmed the Goodness of Providence so much) provided *Lip* signifies *Tongue*. It was the Project that alarmed and brought God down to the Earth; and it must be that new Scheme of Religion, and the Building of the City, as the Snare; and their Tower as a Temple and Castle both, that God came to put a Stop to. And if *Lip* will bear this Construction, and can be referred to that Consent they were all drawn into, of setting up a new God, the Face of the Story evidently leads to it.

The first Verse says, "The whole Earth" was one Lip, and the same Words." This is ver. 6. "being one People, and of one" "Lip." The whole Earth before the Flood, or *all Flesh had corrupted its Way*, and yet *Noah* and his Sons had not; (Dr. Sharp for-
gets

gets this in several Parts of his Antiquity) and all the Earth might again corrupt their Way, or go into Measures that would infallibly corrupt it in Time, without *Noah* and his immediate Sons, or even some other principal Persons, joining in the Scheme of the deluded Multitude; and God might confound the *Lip of all the Earth*, without meddling with the *Lip of Noah*, and several other pious Men, who might, in Time, and with the Help of God's personal Presence, bring their own more appropriate Parties back to Sense and Reason. What *Noah* did on this Occasion we are not told, and can only conjecture, that he was not confederate in this *evil Word*, from his Character as a *Prophet and Preacher of Righteousness*; but what is of Importance to us, with regard to Religion, and that Language which is the Repository of it, we are informed, that *Shem*, and his Line by *Arphaxad*, *Salah* down to *Terah* and *Abraham*, were not concerned in the Plot, or drawn into the Sin of it; and by them was *Christianity* and *Hebrew* preserved to the World. But what Hint is there all this while about their Language, or what has a *dialectical* Unity to do, either in plotting, or a dialectical Difference to do, in breaking these Measures? Such a Difference, though miraculously brought upon them, could not alone counterplot such a Scheme as this; and other Causes are assigned for the Dispersion, as are more than sufficient for

for interrupting the Building and Scheme they were upon. More Tongues, or as many however, as are supposed to have been here, were confederate together in this very Scheme in *Nebuchadnezzar's* Time, and fell down, notwithstanding their great Diversity of Languages, with one Consent, and at one Time, before his Image. They had all one *Lip*, though many Tongues.

The Scripture does not tell us what Method God took, whether Force or Persuasion, to break the Conspiracy, and disunite the League of *Babel*. *God came down to them.* This is all that is said. God came in Person to all *Israel* at *Bochim*, and expostulated with them—"Ye have not obeyed my Voice. "Why have ye done this? And the People "lift up their Voice and wept, *Jud. ii.*" The like Remonstrance and personal Appearance of God must have a like Effect upon the better Sort at *Babel*, who, when the Snare that was set for them, and the Wickedness of the Attempt was made appear, would desist from it, disunite, and separate in their proper Bodies. They were not all turned Devils at once. Could they help reverencing God when they saw him? *Canaan*, one of the wickedest of them, except his Nephew *Nimrod*, was not compleatly so, till in his Posterity above six hundred Years afterwards, when they were destroyed as being sunk into that Gulph of Corruption, which the worshipping
of

of the Heavens had opened under them. This *Lip*, or Confession, for such it is allowed *Lip*, stands for in some Parts of Scripture, was greatly disconcerted for the present, but too soon gained its Ground in different Countries; but the Rapidity of its Spread was stopt by the seasonable Check given it by God in Person; and the Distance to which the Confederates were dispersed from each other, who quarrelling, as all Nations do, with one another, about their private Ends of Ambition and Interest, was one principal Means of *confounding*, or bringing to nothing the whole of it, each destroying each others Images and hieroglyphical Records (which were all the Ways they had of preserving Knowledge, till long after *Moses*) as the Tide of War prevailed. There was a *Lip* in Mr. *H—n's* Sense of it, set up at *Babel*; a wicked Attempt, or wicked Counsel, was here plotted, and come into by so great a Majority, as to call them *all the Earth*: The Word *Lip* it is allowed is a proper Word for such a wicked Counsel. This Counsel, whether you understand it, as I suppose Dr. *Sharp* does, of a Design of getting above the Clouds, and fighting with God in Heaven itself, *according to the old Hypothesis*, this *Lip* was confounded. These several Points we are all agreed in, and the Question is, Whether the *Lip*, God is said to confound, be this wicked Counsel; or it were the *Lip*, *i. e.* the Pronunciation, *i. e.* the

the Tongue of all the Earth. They who hastily conclude it must be the *Tongue*, because the Tongue, they think is the same as the Lip, in some Places of Scripture, certainly conclude too soon, till they have shewn it cannot mean *Confession* here ; or that no Confession was set up here, or that the Confusion of such a Confession implys a Confusion of their Language with it ; and that the Text speaks both, of their *Language* and *Consent* to a new Confusion, for it certainly does of the latter,

That the Heavens were the Objects of the heathen Worship, and that this *Confession*, was in Time so far confounded, as that Mankind could give no Account, or understand, *no one*, his own, much less another's Meaning, in their religious Ceremonies ; or could give any consistent Account, Evidence or Proof in Behalf of their Gods, are certain Truths ; not yet so much as attempted to be contested ; unless a malevolent Squint or two at the new Hypothesis of Idolatry, may be looked on as an Attempt towards it.

Thus the Context leads us to *Confession*, for the *Lip* that God came down to confound ; because it is certain he came down to *confound a Confession*. But as to confounding a Tongue, or *dividing a Tongue*, there is not one *certain* Word said about it. It is only a Surmise that God divided the League by dividing their Tongue, because he did break the Conspiracy,
or

or divide the People there. As to the Means, God appeared to them, and he might do so in *Fire*, surrounded with stormy Winds and Tempest, as at *Sinai*; and break forth as he did upon the *Aegyptians* in Fury; or, which is more likely, in a milder Manner as at *Bockim*, and expostulate with the People as he did there, and recall them to a proper Sense of their Duty. He came down, not for Curiosity, to see the City and Tower, but prevent the ill Effects, and break the Conspiracy. This is all the Text says. At least, on this Construction of *Lip*, every Word, is fulfilled; but not if you take *Lip* for *Tongue*, for then it says nothing about the main Business.

And as to a *Confusion* of Language, It is allowed on all Hands, that *Canaan* the Son of *Ham*, had the same Language with *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and in which *Moses* wrote. This alone is a strong Presumption, that there were no Languages miraculously formed at *Babel*, because those who were the deepest concerned in the Wickedness that brought the Punishment, in Justice would have had the largest Share of the *Confusion* that was to punish and defeat it. Besides here, the most distant Relations are *confounded* into the same Dialect, without any Regard had to the different Countries they were to go, and did go into. The Language of *Nimrod* at *Babylon*, and of *Asker* at *Nineveh*, was the same. And if *Canaan* had the same Tongue with the People
of

of God, and Line of the Prophets; and *Nimrod* with the second Son of *Shem*, the Father of the holy Line, can we suppose that every other Colony had not the same at first, till Time and something extraordinary occasioned so total a Difference in such a Number of Places?

SYRIAC and **HEBREW** the same at first.

It is somewhat extraordinary, upon the Footing of a miraculous Multiplication of Tongues, that *Asher* the Son of *Shem*, and *Nimrod* a Grandson of *Ham*, two rival Princes, of such different Families, in opposite Interests, and such constant Opposers of each other, as their Kingdoms were after them, should yet be confounded into the same Language. *Nimrod* at *Babel*, and *Asher* at *Nineveh*, the two greatest Cities of the World, and Heads of such extensive Empires, are yet so joined in Punishment as to be forced into the same Language; while every petty Family is divided and subdivided, into as many Tongues almost as there were Men in it. We should naturally expect, upon such a Supposition, that the Line of *Ham*, should be separated by this Wall of Confusion, which their own Iniquity made necessary, from those, who by leaving *Babel*, and its wicked Foundations, so plainly protested against their wicked Device. *Aramith* was the common Language of the *Babylonian*, afterwards called

called *Chaldean*, the *Assyrian* and *Syrian* Empires ; and *Balaam* was a Prophet of *Jehovah* within the latter, as low down as the Children of *Israel*'s coming out of *Aegypt* ; so that the Religion of one had been the Opposite of the other, though their Tongue was the same. It is true that the *Aramith* or *Syriac* differed in *Hexekiah*'s Time from the *Hebrew* ; but if different Nations had different Languages at first, these different and opposite Nations must have had so, and the Language of one or the other must have changed in Time. And if of one, why not of both ? Language changes gradually, and so the People of the same Age have the same Language, though differing from that of some distant Age. The *Hebrew* of *Asker* and *Nimrod*, supposing that their Language after the Dispersion, must in such a Course of Years, as from *Asker* to *Hexekiah*, have undergone some Change ; and might very well degenerate into the *Syriac* of after Times. Nor is it possible to conceive how the Language of two such Kingdoms should change into the same, unless they had gradually changed from the same. And yet, on the Supposition of a *Confusion of Tongues*, one or the other must have changed ; for the Heads of two such different Families, must have had different Languages.

But though old *Syriac* differed from the *Hebrew* in the Days of *Hexekiah*, it did not differ in the Time of *Laban* and *Jacob*, as is plain

plain from the Contract between them, *Gen.* xxxi. and indeed from the whole History of *Laban*, and *Jacob* during his Abode among the Children of the East. *Jacob* meets with some Shepherds in the Fields at his first coming, and talks to them without any Interpreter. Was he inspired with the *Syriac*, or they with the *Hebrew*? Or had he learnt their Tongue before he came? No such Thing appears. *Rachel* comes with her Father's Sheep; *Jacob* makes himself known to her. No Hint of any Interpreter between them, or of her understanding *Hebrew*; any more than there is of his talking *Syriac*. The family Names, *Laban*, *Leab*, *Rachel*, and many others, are *Hebrew*, and all of the *Hebrew* Form and Manner of Termination. The two Sisters give Names to their Children, *Reuben*, *Simson*, *Levi*, *Judah*, and so on. All again of the *Hebrew* Interpretation and Structure, without any Mixture or Appearance of what *Syriac* was afterwards. But the Settling the Bounds betwixt *Laban* and *Jacob*, though generally brought on the opposite Side, is a direct Proof, that there was no Difference in *Dialect*, betwixt *Laban* the *Aramite*, and *Jacob* the *Hebrew*. — Ver. 43.

“ *Laban* said unto *Jacob*—let us make a Co-
 “ venant I and thou, and let it be for a Wit-
 “ ness—and they took Stones and made an
 “ Heap. Ver. 47. And *Laban* called it, (as
 “ I write the Words) *Iger Sheduta*; and
 “ *Jacob* called it *Gilod*. Ver. 48. And *La-*

“ *ban* said, this Heap is a Witness between
 “ me and thee, this Day, therefore he called
 “ the Name of it *Gilod*.” Here is one *He-*
brew Name given this Heap, or at least, con-
 sented to by *Laban*; who gives the Reason
 himself of its Name, according to the *Hebrew*.
 “ It is *Gil od*, therefore he called its Name
 “ *Gilod*. And *Mizpeh*, for he, (*viz. Laban*)
 “ said, the Lord *watch* between me and thee
 “ —if thou shalt afflict my Daughters,—
 “ see God is Witness between me and thee.”

Here is a second *Hebrew* Name given this
 Place by *Laban*, with a Reason in *Hebrew* for
 it: The Verb corresponding in *Sound* and *Sense*
 with the Name and Etymology he assigns of
 it. *Laban* continues, and says, what suffi-
 ciently explains his first Name, *לָבָן שְׂדֵדוּתָא*,
 according to its *Hebrew* Etymology. Ver. li.

“ *Laban* said to *Jacob*, behold this Heap, and
 “ behold this Pillar, which I have cast betwixt
 “ me and thee; this Heap be Witness, and
 “ the Pillar be Witness, that *I will not pass*
 “ *over this Heap to thee, and that thou shalt*
 “ *not pass over this Heap, and this Pillar,*
 “ *to me, for Harm.* The God of *Abraham*,
 “ and the God of *Nabor*, judge between us.”

That is, let the Judgment of God fall upon
 him that shall presume to pass the *Bound-Stone*,
 to the Hurt of the other; which is what is
 comprised in *Iger Sbeduta*. *לָבָן* Fear, *שְׂדֵדוּתָא*
Witness, and *נָר* (is used both as *Noun* and
Verb for Bounds or Limits, see *Gen. xlix. 26.*

and

and *Numb. xxxiv. 7, 8.* *תחמו* *limitabitis vobis ab Monte Hor.* *Ye shall set your Bounds at Mount Hor,*) *Bounds.* So that *Iger* *יגר*, which is a pure *Hebrew* Word for *Fear*, the Fear of the Judgment of God upon the Transgressor having been annexed to the *Witness-Heap*; and *Shed* *שדר*, a *Witness* in *Hebrew*, and *Ta* *תא*, *Bounds*, which neither was to pass under the Fear of the Judgment of God; these two Words, *Iger*, a simple Word, and *Sheduta* a compound one, fully take in the Reasons *Laban* gives, ver. 51, 52. for the Name he imposed on this Place; as *Gilod* does, what he says, ver. 48. and *Mizpah*, what he says, ver. 49 and 50. I am quite at a Loss to guess what it was, that has always induced the Learned, to give these two Words *Iger* and *Sheduta*, in Proof for a Difference of Dialects, so early as the Days of *Jacob*, when they are both pure *Hebrew*, and so fully answer the Intent of this Contract and Witness, betwixt *Laban* and him, and the solemn Imprecation of God's Judgment upon him that should pass those *Bounds* to the Hurt of the other. They seem to have thought it necessary, that *Heap* should be expressed in *Iger*; and nothing but *Witness* in *Sheduta*, because no more is expressed in *Gilod*. *Laban* had allowed it to be a *Witness-Heap*, in calling it *Gilod*. He had placed it for the *Bounds* between them, and solemnly invoked a *Witness* that each should fear; and why not express as

much in one of the three Names he gave it?

Mr. H—y says, “גָּרַר *yegar*, pl. גָּרָרִין is a Noun of the *Chaldee* Form, made of the *Hebrew* Word גָּרַר to collect, and so to heap Things together.” *Primævity*, p. 32.

But why not the *Hebrew* Word גָּרַר to fear, when the Fear of God was so solemnly annexed to it? *Laban* had expressed a *Heap* in *Gilod*; but expresses the Fear of the Judgment of God he stakes for Performance, in nothing, if not in this Word; any more than its being their Bounds, if not in גָּרַר. Let me add, that *Iger* is not *Syriac* for a *Heap*. *Semel in Genesi Mosaica usurpatur a Labano Syro, i. e. it is once used in Genesis by Laban, the Syrian: Crinesius in his Chaldee Lexicon.*

“The other Word שְׁהוּדוּתָא a *Witness*, is a Noun of the Verb שָׁהַד,” says Mr. H—y *Ibid*, taking this for an uncompounded Word; and it has a Look like what the *Syriac* had in after Ages. But the two other *Hebrew* Names, *Gilod* and *Mizpah*, given by *Laban*, not being *Syriac*; nor *Iger*, which is coupled with this; and the Declaration he makes of his own Meaning, that, *that should be the Bound-Stone, which God should be a Witness to, and his Judgment, a Terror to each, from passing it to the Hurt of the other*, so plainly point out the compound Sense of the *Hebrew Etymology*, that to me it appears decisive, notwithstanding the Testimony of the *Vulgate*,

*Vulgate, that Laban and Jacob spoke each according to the Propriety of their own Tongue. They declare their Meaning, in those Names, each of them, according to the Propriety of the Hebrew Tongue. Mr. H——y would have שֶׁר "an Aramitish Word, being a plain " Corruption of the Hebrew עֶר Hed, a Wit-
" ness; with the Relative ש prefixed." Ibid. But why not as well say, that עֶר is a Corruption from שֶׁר, by flinging away the Relative ש, and changing ה into ע, which there is as good Authority for as changing ע into ה. This changing of Serviles into Radicals, and Radicals into Serviles, opens a wide Door. But how again can שֶׁר be an Aramitish Word, unless Job, the Arabian, also talked Syriac, or Syriac and Hebrew were the same? If Job was an Edomite, as it appears he was, his Language must be Hebrew, as being descended from Isaac, and Brother to Jacob, whose Language was so.*

HEBREW and ÆGYPTIAN the Same.

There is plain Proof that *Abraham* and the *Canaanites* had the same Language; and that the Children of *Israel* brought that Language up with them out of *Ægypt* they carried down into it; which it is naturally impossible they should have done, if the Language of *Ægypt* had then differed from their own. They came down but few in Number; were

intermixed with the *Ægyptians*, being set over their Cattle and otherwise; and as there were but few Women among them, when they came down, they must marry *Ægyptian* Women, as *Joseph* had done; whole Sons must learn the *Ægyptian* Tongue from their Mothers, unless their Mothers were inspired with *Hebrew* as soon as they married *Hebrew* Husbands. *Ephraim* and *Manasseh*, under an *Ægyptian* Mother and *Ægyptian* Servants, could not avoid learning the *Ægyptian*, or rather getting a Corruption of both, had there been any Difference. When *Pharaoh* set Task-Masters over them, before the Birth of *Moses*, fourscore Years and upwards before the *Exodus*, and employed them in building of Cities, and the Oppression grew so severe, that it was resolved to extirpate the whole Nation, by slaying all the male Children that should be born, and wear out those that were living in the heaviest Slavery, such an Intermixture with their cruel Masters, must have forced them into their Tongue; for their Masters, we may imagine, would not condescend to use their Tongue. They lost their Language in a seventy Years Captivity in *Babylon*; a Captivity not much above a Quarter as long as this! Nor was their Servitude there any Thing like so severe as this. Can any other Reason be given for the *Hebrew* escaping a Confusion in *Ægypt*, and being so entirely lost in it at *Babylon*, but that there was no other

other Tongue in *Ægypt* to mix with and confound it? Unless there was somewhat peculiarly fatal to the Constitution of Language in the Climate of *Babylon*. When *Pharoah's* Daughter finds *Moses* in the Bulrushes, and his Sister, who was a Girl, set to watch, comes up and talks with her, are we to say, that the Princess had been taught *Hebrew*, or the Girl the *Ægyptian* Language by her Friends? or that one or other was inspired with a Language known before but to one of them? It can hardly be supposed that the Language of their Slaves should be Part of the Princess's Education; and yet, she not only holds a Conversation with a *Hebrew* Girl, but gives the Child an *Hebrew* Name, *Moses*, and explains it according to the *Hebrew*, מֹשֶׁה *draw out*. Such Names must answer, in *Sound* and *Sense*, to the Etymologies given of them; and this Instance shews, that *Hebrew* and *Ægyptian* coincided in their Form of Grammar, as well as in the *Sense* and *Sound* of *Moses's* Name, "because to give the Construction of a proper Name, instead of the Name itself, is not doing the Part of an Historian." *Dr. Sharp's Antiquity*, p 16.

The Authors of the *Universal History* suppose, that *Moses* altered his own Name; and peremptorily and arbitrarily affirm, that "the original Name is *Mouïse*, or *Mouïses*, and composed of two *Coptic*, or old *Ægyptian* Words, *moï*, *Water*, and *se*, to preserve."

B. I. Cap. ii. Sect. 5. But how do they know all this; They seem to forget that *Moses* was what they sometimes call him, *an inspired Writer*; and if he were not, it is hard they will not allow him to know his own Name. He says, his Name was מֹשֶׁה; (which has nothing for *oil* in it) they say, it was not; he says, the Princess *drew him out of the Water*, and therefore named him so; they say, that was not the Reason of his Name; he positively gives his Name as of *Hebrew Original*; they tell us, it was not, being only *adapted to the Hebrew Etymology*. If the Princess did not give the Reason *Moses* says she did, but he only *introduces* her as *giving* it, when she did not; and it is not derived from the Word he says it is, what becomes of his Veracity? But why forge so useless a Story; and tell the People such a Heap of Falshoods? *To accommodate it to the Understanding of the Jews*, who having lived two hundred Years in *Ægypt*, were unacquainted with the Language. These Gentlemen must give us better Reasons, before they will convince us, that the *etymological Argument* in Favour of the *Hebrew Primævity*, will not bear *Examination*.

But there are other *Names*, which some, and among others, Dr. *Sharp*, think not to be of *Hebrew Origin*, but peculiarly *Ægyptian*. Such as the Titles *Pharoah* gave *Joseph*; his Wife's Name, *Asenath*, and her Father's *Po-
pherab*

tipherah, Priest of *On* or *Aven*. But they are all of *Hebrew* Form, and in Use in *Hebrew* in some Part of Speech or other. The Occasion of the Names *Pharoah* gave *Joseph*, seems to explain them according to their *Hebrew* Interpretation. He gave him Sovereignty over all the Land of *Ægypt*; and orders them to proclaim,

אברך *abrec*, before him. The Reason follows, ונתון אתו. " *And he was set over all the Land of Ægypt.* And *Pharoah* said unto *Joseph*, I am *Pharoah*; and without thee shall no Man lift up his Hand or Foot in all the Land of *Ægypt*." Nouns are formed with an א prefixed in *Hebrew*, as *Ephraim*, אפרח, and fifty others; and there are so many proper Names of Persons compounded with אב, that אב and ברך, or א and ברך, will either of them answer his Character, as one appointed *Father* over the whole Country; the *Blessor*, or the Father of Blessing; without whom no Business could proceed, or any Thing be done. So God tells *Abraham*, he should be a *Blessing* to Mankind, in the spiritual Sense, referring to that Seed of his, who is next to God on the Throne of Majesty. And why might not *Joseph* be called the *Blessor*, as well as *Abraham* the *Blessing*, with respect to his Power, being next to the King on the Throne.

צפנת פענח The first Word is *Hebrew*, and as common a Word as any in the Tongue.

The

The other occurs no where else, as a single Word; but *עַד* and *נָד* are *Hebrew*, and in frequent Use. *עַד* and *נָד* are the Name of a City, where a King of *Edom* dwelt, whose Language must be *Hebrew*, because *Esau* must have his Language from his Father. *Joseph* had discovered a Secret which saved the Lives of all *Aegypt*, and many other Countries, and might be denominated from the Comfort the Discovery of the Secret gave them; or fetch the Reason of the Name from *עַד*, as it signifies to *treasure up*, i. e. to hide and conceal, as Things treasured up are. *עַד* is used as the Title of God's People, *Pf. lxxxiii. 3.* "They have taken crafty Counsel against thy People; and consulted against thy *hidden ones*." And if *עַד* be a personal Title of *Joseph*, neither Grammar, nor the Custom of *Hebrew*, forbid its terminating in *ת*, as *קָהָלֵת* the *Preacher* does; or as we use Nouns in the Abstract for personal Titles. I presume, that the *hidden ones* of God, means his chosen Servants, as they are his *Treasure*; and is applied to them as a Title of great Favour and Affection towards them. And such a particular Regard might be expressed towards *Joseph*, which, with the Addition of *Splendor* and *Comfort*, bears so plain an Allusion to the Occasion, that the *Hebrew Construction* of the Words, as a Name, would alone have led us to have concluded, that some signal Service had been done the Country,

try, by calling him, (suppose we construe it *verbatim*, though compound Titles cannot always bear a literal verbal Construction) *The Treasure of glorious * Comfort*. But it is not incumbent on us, to shew *precisely* what *Pharoah* meant by the Words; it is enough, if we can shew them to be *Hebrew*, and formed *More Hebraico*, and that their general Sense answers to the Occasion of the Name. So,

אסנא *Asenath*, is an *Hebrew* Word in Use and Form. אסנא is *Misfortune* or *Mischief*. I suppose it will not be necessary, to shew, that *Poti-pherah*, her Father, meant *unfortunate* by it; or why he gave his Daughter that Name; (as we can why *Ephraim* named his Son *Beriah*, sc. *In Evil*) it is enough that it is *Hebrew*. As is also,

פוט־פֶּרֶה *Poti-pherah*, her Father's Name. And,

פוט־פֶּרֶה *Potiphar*, who bought *Joseph*. פֶּרֶה and פֶּר are common *Hebrew* Words; and פוט the Name of one of the Sons of *Ham* before the *Confusion of Babel*, and so no *Ægyptian* Word exclusively; and is compounded with אֵל, *Exodus* vi. 25. the Name of *Eleazer's* Father-in-Law.

אֵן and אֵנָּה, *On* and *Aven* in *Ægypt*, are as much *Hebrew*, as *Aven* in *Canaan*: The Name

* אֵן *splenduit* is often used to this Purpose, as *Job* x. 3. *Shine upon the Counsel of the Wicked.* *Psal.* l. 2. lxxx. 2. &c. *Shining forth in Help and Assistance.*

Name of the Deity, or Attribute of the true God, as well as of the false, afterwards. These, and other proper Names of Persons and Places in *Ægypt*, are all *Hebrew*; and if it should be said, they might be *Ægyptian* too, they shew such an Affinity between the two Languages, that never could consist with their Being, as is supposed, of different Origins. At least thus much follows from this Similarity between them, that the *Proof* of a Difference fails; because, if those Words, that are usually offered as *Ægyptian* Words, may be *Hebrew*, then the Proof fails, of these being in the Time of *Joseph*, two different Tongues. A Confusion that swallowed up one Tongue, and poured out two such in the Room of it, must have made no more Alteration in it, than the melting Pot doth in Gold. And it will be harder to shew, why the *Confusion* made so little Difference, than that it made none. But setting aside the wrong Construction of the Affair at *Babel*, sets aside the Necessity of insisting much on collateral Evidence; though some of it lies so plain, and the Inference is so obvious, that it has made many suspect the Account as it stands, and puzzled others, and involved them in Difficulties, which Conjectures, forced Derivations, and arbitrary Assertions, have been made to remove, which would never have been studied, thought of, nor admitted by the Learned, but that when they had

had made one false Step, or rather followed those who had made one, another follows of course. The Craft of the *Gibeonites*, to impose a League on *Joshua* and *Israel*, which is so minutely related, as to descend to their Coats, Shoes, Wine-Skins, Sacks and Bread, omits the most material Circumstance of all, the Difference of Language, which People of so distant a Country, as they pretended to be of, must have had. Surely this Part of their Plot would have been mentioned, had any such Difference then been known to have subsisted between the most distant Nations. We should have heard of the Interpreters between them; and they would have counterfeited a Gibberish, which their Interpreters, who were in the Secret, would have gravely interpreted. But as nothing of this appears, it is plain, neither Side thought such a Part necessary to be acted.

And what is no small Confirmation of the *Aegyptian* and *Hebrew* being at first the same, is, that the Language of the *Philistines*, who descended from a Son of *Mizraim*, was the same, as appears by their whole History; and this the Authors of the *Universal History*, who are strenuous Assertors of a Confusion of Tongues, (the great Variety of which they think can't possibly be otherwise accounted for) this they allow, Vol. II. B. I. Cap. iv. " Their Language was not so different from " that spoken by the *Hebrew*, as to cause any " Dif-

“ Difficulty for them to converse together, as
 “ will be perceived by their Intercourse with
 “ *Abraham* and *Isaac*.” And this I think is
 generally allowed; and the Names of *Persons*
 and *Places* prove it. *Abimelech*, *Gerar*, *Gaza*,
Gath, *Echron*, &c. are pure *Hebrew*; which
 is a full Proof that the Language of the
 Country they came from was the *Hebrew*.
 It is a fair Inference, that if the *Philistines*
 spoke the *Hebrew* Tongue, the Language of
Ægypt, they came out of, was the *Hebrew*
 too. The great Intercourse betwixt *Abra-*
ham, *Isaac*, and the Children of *Israel*, upon
 their Return from *Ægypt*, with the *Phi-*
listines, afforded Opportunities enough, to
 mention a Difference in Language between
 them, had there been any, as the History
 doth many plain Proofs of their being the
 same.

The *Philistines* and *Caphtorim*, *Gen. x.*
14. came out of *Cashlubim*, and were in Pos-
 session of their Country when *Abraham* came
 into *Canaan*; they and the *Caphtorim* were
 united as one People, *Jer. xlvii. 4.* “ The
 “ *Philistines*, the Remnant of the Coun-
 “ try, (Isle) of *Caphtor*.” *Am. ix. 7.*
 “ The *Philistines* from *Caphtor*.” Some
 make *Caphtor* to be *Cappadocia*; still they
 must have brought the same Language into
Palestine they spoke in *Caphtor*; and if that
 was the *Hebrew*, whether they were a Co-
 lony from *Ægypt*, or *Cappadocia*, (i. e. from
Ægypt

Egypt to Cappadocia, and thence to Palestine) the Inference holds strongly against the vulgar Notion of a miraculous Multiplication of Tongues at *Babel*.

In short, if a *Confusion of Language*, or swallowing up *the Tongue of all the Earth*, were necessary to disconcert the wicked Measures taken at *Babel*, the Tongue seems to have come out as whole, and as unhurt, as *Jonah* out of the Whale's Belly; and though I believe that *Jonah* was, because the Text says it, I am convinced the *Hebrew* or first Language was not, swallowed up, at all; it might change by Degrees, and other Languages arise in the *East* as they had done in the *West*, owing to something of the like Causes; and when they had begun to multiply, would, as Men did, grow without Number, in a much less Space of Time than two or three were formed in at first. But at first hand, when there could be but one Language, the People few in Comparison, occupied all in the same Way, their Religion and Habitation the same, or near enough for Correspondence, there could be no Room for Alterations; and when they parted asunder, Time must run on, before their Tongues could run wild; and it is above twelve hundred Years from the Dispersion, before we have the least Hint of any Difference in Dialect: Unless that one *monumental Name of Laban's*, and the other of *Pharoah's*, are to be

be deemed such; about which, I hope, we may call for a Re-hearing. Dr. *Sharp* indeed on my saying so before, asks, whether "God's
 " confounding *the one Language of the Earth*
 " at *Babel*—may not be looked upon as a
 " *Hint* at least, *Antiq.* p. 22." I answer, not till he has proved that *Lip* and *Tongue* are the same Thing; and that *confounding* is the same as *multiplying*. But may I not ask, whether he does not think my Meaning was, that we have no *Hint* in any other Part of Scripture to confirm their Interpretation of this; it being impossible, one would think, that in the History of upwards of twelve hundred Years not a single *Hint* should be dropt of such a material Difference, when after the Time of *Hezekiah* you have it in almost every Page of the sacred History. The Fidelity of the History required the Mention of such a Circumstance, had there been Room for it, as well before the Time of *Hezekiah* as after it. What Reason can be given for this Silence, but that there was no such Variety of Languages, as is pretended, till about that Time. The Prediction, *Deut.* xxviii. 49. That God would bring upon the *Jews* a Nation whose Tongue they should not understand, speaks of it, as something extraordinary for one People not to understand the Language of another, and amounts to a plain Declaration, that there was no such People then in Being, whose Tongue they did not understand.

stand. Had every Nation then had a different *Tongue*, according to the old Hypothesis, where would have been the Sense of telling them, that in twelve hundred Years Time God would send against them a People of another Language, which they should not understand, when they are supposed not to have understood that of their own Neighbours; nay, not that of *Egypt*, where they had sojourned two hundred Years. But when we call, as we justly may, for some Hint of such a Difference in the Course of so many Years, to justify the forced Construction of confounding the *Lip* of all the Earth, to reply, that, that very Misconstruction is a Hint, is not quite so direct an Answer as we might have expected; but it is a direct sophistical Turn. The Doctor is pleased to give my Words, *Script. M.* p. 88, after citing the great *Ravis*, that, *all the best Authors do earnestly contend to have Hebrew escape a Confusion at Babel.* I add, *Ravis* says, "*all the best Authors are on our Side.*"

"I must beg Leave, says the Doctor, to ask him how this can be?—From what did *Hebrew*, as a Language, escape, according to their new Account of the Confusion? p. 81." The Dispute was, whether *Hebrew* was confounded at *Babel*, or, in the Doctor's Phrase, *were a Plank of the Ship wreck there*, (it being customary, in those ancient Times, to sail by *Land*, as well as *Sea*).

and do not *Ravis*, and all the best Authors, who say it *escaped the Confusion* there, say, at the same Time, that it *suffered* no Confusion there? If the *Hebrew* escaped the (supposed) Confusion at *Babel*, it was not confounded there. This Piece of Sophistry, or rather Quibble, is the lowest, and meanest, ever offered by a Man who pretended to common Sense. Dr. *Sharp* was grown fond of an Expression, that it appears since, dropt from a late Bishop of *Durham*, the learned Dr. *Chandler*, and hints, that *Hebrew* might be “no more than a Plank of the Shipwreck at “*Babel*.” A Sentiment, that we have Reason to think, had it come from Mr *H—n*, would have met with another Reception from Dr. *Sharp*. Against this I cited the above Authority from *Ravis*, that all the best Authors contend earnestly for the contrary, and are on our Side as to the Primævity of the *Hebrew* Tongue. And whether *Ravis* be right or wrong, and all the best Authors with him (the Fathers and our Church) in asserting the Antiquity of it, they are still all of our Side in that Respect, though they did believe there was a *Confusion*, which Mr. *H—n* has disproved. But I need not spend Time on these smaller Specimens of the Doctor's Candour and Ingenuity; when there remain so many more, of a higher Kind, for him to reconcile to the common Notions People have of Justice and Veracity; and which, though often

often called upon, he has as yet wholly overlooked. His Friend, the M. Apologist, and himself, if they are not the same, have fathered several *impious Suppositions*, as they justly call them, upon Mr. H——n, without the least Authority for them, from his Writings; and dealt with his Character, as the Inquisition does with the Bodies of those, who are so unhappy, as to incur its *Odium Ecclesiasticum*. The Doctor has had the Pen in his Hand several Times since they were pointed out to him, but cannot condescend to do Justice.

The Text under Consideration is supposed to say, that Tongues were multiplied at *Babel*. In the Versions it speaks of *confounding one Language*, but not a Word of making others. Some *swallow up* the original Tongue, and leave Men without any, much less in Possession of many. Others *mix* it. But there was no other to *mix* with it. An homogeneous Body mixed with itself only, will for ever continue the same; nor is their metaphorical Language more to their Purpose, than it is proper in itself. Upon the the Comparison of a Tongue to a Ship, a Ship sailing at Land, and running foul of a City, are harsh Figures, and contrary in their Meaning to the plain Letter of the Text, they would be supposed to steer by; for *confound*, is not splitting a Thing into many Pieces, as a Ship is when it is wreck-

ed; neither can a new Language be called a Part of the old any more than a *new Ship* can be called a Plank of a Shipwreck; nor can a new Ship be made out of a Plank. The supposed new Languages at *Babel* were not *Planks*, but whole Ships, as much as that which was supposed to have been wrecked there; and it is to be wished, the Doctor would consider what the Text means by *confound*, and what he means himself, when he calls one Language a Plank of another. *Language*, like a Ship running foul of a Rock at Sea, was wrecked and broke into Pieces; and it not being now necessary, the Sea should *swallow it up*, some Planks, he says, swam ashore, and he calls those Planks Ships; as if a Ship, when it broke to Pieces, broke into a Number of other Ships: And yet this metaphorical Language, as coming, though but *familiariter* from a great Man, seems to be his chief Argument for the *Hebrew* being a *new-made Tongue* at *Babel*; and what first biased him from the *old Hypothesis*.

The new Hypothesis espoused by Dr. *Sharp* judges right indeed, that the Language of *Noah* and *Shem* was involved in the *Confusion*, if the old Hypothesis, (which coincides with their new one in the Construction of the Words) does not fail in the Construction of *Lip*; for then the first Language must have been entirely *swallowed up*, so far, that no two Persons understood one another. The Text,

Text, as translated, says, " Let us confound
 " their Language, that *one* may not under-
 " stand the Language of another." A Thing
 hardly credible. And that God should leave
 Mankind in this deplorable Situation; unable
 to speak to one another; scattered likewise
 over the Face of all the Earth. To say, that
 God inspired the several Families, each with
 a new Tongue, is saying, what the Text doth
 not say. This *Confusion* is supposed to have
dispersed them; the Effect must bear a Pro-
 portion to the Cause, and the *Dispersion* be as
 minute as the *Confusion*; this extended to In-
 dividuals, and so must that. So general a
 Confusion must have had the same Effect on
 single Persons, as on whole Families. If the
 Families of *Japhet* and *Shem* were separated
 by this *Confusion*, as is supposed, then the pri-
 vate Family of *Gomer*, or *Madai*, would se-
 parate, Man by Man from each other, for the
 same Reason, *because they could not understand*
one another; and that very Separation would
 have prevented their getting one common
 Language by their own Help; and we shall
 be obliged to have Recourse to Miracle again,
 to *reunite* Men, after they had been miracu-
 lously dispersed; and to inspire them with a
 new Language, after the old had been mira-
 culously destroyed; Of which we have no
 Mention in the Text.

But we are to suppose, the *Confusion*, and
 consequent *Dispersion*, to extend only to Bo-

dies of Men; and that *Noah*, and the holy Line with him, viz. *Shem*, *Arphaxad*, and so forth, got a new Language as well as others; yet that was the *Hebrew* is plain, because it was *Abraham's*, who belonged to the Family during the Life of *Shem*, *Arphaxad*, *Salah*, *Eber*, *Kan*, *Serug*, *Nabar*, and his Father, *Terah*, and was old enough to converse with any of them before their Deaths; and therefore his Language and their's must be the same; his was the *Hebrew*, and therefore their's was. *Abraham* must have his Language from his Father, who living and conversing with *Noah* above an hundred Years, and all the other Patriarchs and High-Priests of God, must have the same Language they had. *Shem* was preferred to his two Brothers, as *Jacob* to *Esau*, as the Patriarch, and, of course, Priest of God; and consequently lived with his Father, and his Sons, who were the Heads of the Church of God, and who must officiate under him in it. I lay it down as a Certainty, that *Shem*, *Arphaxad*, and so down to *Terah* and *Abraham*, the successive Heads of the Church, did live together, till we are told that God separated *Terah* from his Kindred and from his Father's House. Whatever Country any Father of the holy Line had gone into we should have found their immediate Heir or Heirs with them in that Country, as we find *Isaac* with *Abraham*

Abraham in *Canaan*, and *Jacob* with *Isaac*,
 and the twelve Patriarchs with *Jacob*. Had
Heber, *e. gr.* been seated elsewhere than at
Ur, we should have found *Peleg* there with
 him, and *Nabor* with *Peleg*, and *Terah*, as
 we do, with *Nabor*, at *Ur*. *Terah* lived with
 מולדתו his Progenitors in *Ur*, and therefore
 must have the same Language with them;
 and as his was the *Hebrew*, their's was. And
 we have this plain Reason to think, it was
 not confounded in their Mouths, (besides the
 etymological one, which we shall enquire a
 little further into presently) because it appears
 that *Shem* was not involved in the Sin of *Ba-
 bel*, consequently not in the Punishment.
 The Punishment would extend no further
 than the Crime. The Crime was a *Settle-
 ment* at *Babel*: *Let us build us a City and a
 Tower*, with the additional Guilt of setting up
 Idolatry. *Shem* continued a Sojourner in the
 Territories of *Aram*, as did *Arphaxad* and
Salah, down to *Abraham*. *Shem* is called
 the Father כל בני עבר, an Expression which
 has puzzled the Learned, as much as *con-
 founding the Lip of all the Earth*, has; though
 the Misconstruction is not big with so many
 Absurdities, as the other. עבר, writ *Eber*
 in the *English*, was the Name of a great
 Grandson of *Shem*, the Person supposed to
 be meant. But in what Sense *Shem* could
 be called the Father of the Children of his
 great Grandson, at all; or, if at all, more than

of the Children of his intermediate or subsequent Sons, has not been shewn. *Shem* is a Passenger, Pilgrim, Itinerant, one who passes from one Place to another. *Shem* obtained the Title of *Father of all the Sojourners* or *Church-Pilgrims*. Such the holy Line was to be, and was, till their Settlement in *Canaan*; and after that, as well as before, all true Believers looked upon themselves as *Sojourners*, and *Strangers* upon Earth. But now, in Opposition to the Settlement proposed at *Babel*, and with Respect to the Possession of *Canaan* in due Time, the Title became doubly proper to *Shem* and the holy Line; and they were Sojourners all along in the Territory of *Aram*, and are denominated *Armites*, as Inhabitants there, but not as Proprietors: For had the Country been theirs, it must have been named from *Shem*, and not from *Aram*, his younger Brother. They continued Sojourners, and preserved the Faith of the true God, which is sufficient Proof that they were not in the Guilt, and consequently not in the Restraint, viz. The Confusion supposed to be put upon the Guilt.

This likewise accounts for the Title of *Eber*, or *Hebrew*, following *Abram*, and his Family, and not his Brother *Nabor's*, and

I would not forestall Dr. Sharp, or rob him of the Pleasure, in finding out, that *Shem* is not the Word used where the true Believers are called *Sojourners* and *Strangers* in other Parts of Scripture.

the other Branches of the same Family, beyond the River. They were not *Sojourners*; this Part of the Family was.

It may be hard, and the Attempt to assign an etymological Reason for all the *Ante-Babel* Names lays open to Fancy and Imagination; yet many of them bespeak themselves *Hebrew*; and many are explained as such. *Adam* is explained. *קין Cain*, is explained from *קנין* to acquire. *אבל Abel*, bespeaks itself, *Vanity*.

But here the *Universal History* objects again, and gives this as an Instance of, "those Names which are more pertinently derived from some other of the *Oriental Tongues*." And *Dr. Sharp*, by using their Language, seems to have his Eye upon the Instances they have pitched upon.

"*Abel*, or *Hebel*, say the Gentlemen Authors, which in *Hebrew* signifies *Vanity*, or a *Vapour*, seems a Name not very apposite to *Adam's* second Son." They do not give any Reason for this; though the Name seems as apposite to him as any Son of *Adam*, being the first Man whose Death proved Life to be a *Vapour* that soon passes away; dying a violent Death, before he had arrived at much above a tenth Part of the then allotted Age of Man. "But if derived, say they, from the *Syriac* *אביל yhabil*, which answers to the *Latin Deus dedit*, it is very proper." No more proper for his Name than that of any other Man. *God gives all alike*; and all are

are Vanity, a Vapour : So that Name is not less general than the other. Why then is it *more proper* ? Only because they have a mind to say so ? But suppose **חבל** to be imperfectly written ; why is not the *Hebrew* **חב** and **ל** as *pertinent* as the *Syriac* Etymology ? But what becomes of the two *Jads* and the *Aleph* in the *Syriac* Words ; by what Rules are they dropt ? They might as well have made as short of it as they did before, and asserted, that the Name was originally *Syriac*, and writ at large **יחבאל** till *Moses* adopted it to the *Hebrew* Capacity of the Jews, their own **חבאל** not being so *pertinent* as the *Syriac* **יחבאל**. These Gentlemen are Men of extensive reading, and too quick Judgment and Apprehension, to leave any Thing short, or not to make the most of their Argument ; and doubtless did not know of any Instances more *pertinent* to their Purpose than they have produced ; and how far these two will go, let them judge themselves ; for though they, on too many Occasions, forget the Deference due to inspired Writings, yet they have given many Specimens of their Candour and Ingenuity, as well as of their Abilities, Care and Pains, in compiling this comprehensive and useful Work. *Babel*, which they give as another Instance of a more *pertinent* *Syriac* Etymology, I am apt to think, came from their not considering the *Hebrew* Derivation, and that there is no anti-

ent

ent Syriac, בבל, used as a Verb; and in later Ages a Word might be formed, as no doubt, our *Babble* is, from the Name of the Place; and not *vice versa*.

Nothing is commoner in Scripture, when it gives us Names or Titles that were imposed in a Language different from that of the Writer, than to add, *which is*, or *which being interpreted*, is so and so. As *Mark* iii. 17. "He surnamed them *Boanerges*, *which is*, "the Sons of Thunder." Sufficiently intimating, that *Boanerges* was not *Greek*, the Language *St. Mark* wrote in. Had *Moses* set such a *N. B.* to the Titles *Laban* gave the *Heap of Witness*, or which *Pharoah* gave to *Joseph*, it would have put the Matter out of Dispute: But that no such Hint should occur in the History of above three thousand Years, though so many Persons and Things are spoke of, which are supposed to have been denominated from other Languages, is very surprizing. Had not *St. Mark* explained *Boanerges*, we should never have known what it meant; and had he not given us the *true Name*, he had not given the *Surname* *Christ* gave the Sons of *Zebedee*. Our Lord, *John* i. 42. gave the Name of *Cephas* to *Simon*, and that Evangelist interprets it. *St. Matthew* xvi. 18. who mentions our Lord's appointing him one of the Apostles, under the Title of a Rock or Stone, twelve of which were to be the Foundation of his Church, omits that Circumstance

circumstance of his being surnamed *Cephas*, and doth not give us the *Word itself* as St. *John* does, because he doth not say, *He should be called Cephas, or Peter; only, thou art Peter, a Stone*; and so needed not to give the original Word and Interpretation of it, as he does when he gives us some foreign Names, e. gr. Chap. xxvii. 33. "A Place called *Golgotha*, this is to say, the Place of a Skull;" and in such *Denominations*, as carry a peculiar Sound as well as Meaning in them, it seems highly proper to give us the *Sound*, or else an Intimation that it is only the Construction of the Word. Dr. *Sharp* would press these two Instances, *Boanerges* and *Cephas*, into his Service, though they are directly opposite to the Argument he is maintaining, as the Reader may see, p. 154. of his *Antiquity*. But to go on.

הַשֵּׁט *Setb*, to appoint. *עֲנוֹכ* *Enosh*, a Word of an equivalent Signification with *Abel*. *קַיִן* *Cain*, as before, from *קָנָה* or *קָנָה*; nothing being commoner in *Hebrew*, than doubling the last Letter of a Root. *מְבַרְכֵי* *Mabakalel*, Praise to God. *יָרֵד* *Jared*, he shall rule. *עֲנוֹכ* *Enosh*, dedicated; a common Name, as of a known Meaning also in *Hebrew*. *לַמְּנוּחַ* *Lamnoch*, the Name of the Father of *Noah*, does not occur in Scripture as one Word, and no Reason is assigned for it; but he assigns one for calling his Son, *נֹחַ* *Noah*, Rest, Peace, Quiet, either from Trouble or Anger, to the

Pacifier,

Pacifier, " saying this same shall comfort us,
 " concerning our Work and Toil of our
 " Hands, *because* of the Ground the Lord
 " hath cursed." i. e. He should appease God,
 and so comfort them; therefore he called him
 נח, which must be the *Sound* of the Name in
 Letters, and answer in Sense to נחם *Comfort*.
 These Words are not of the same *Sound* nor
Sense exactly, but near enough for the Al-
 lusion to the correspondent Meaning of *Rest*
 or *Peace*, to *Comfort*, which answers in any
 Language as to Sense, but not as to Sound.
Shem, *Ham* and *Japhet*, are Names that seem
 prophetically given, at least, two of them,
Shem and *Japhet*. *Shem*, though the younger
 Brother, as the Type, as much as *Abraham*,
 or any other Patriarch, of the Name, that was
 to come and rule all. *Shem* however is *Hebrew*.
 And שם *Japhet*, from פתח to *entice*, *draw*
aside, as a Hinge does a Door; and *Japhet* so
 named, because he was *enticed away*, and
caught again by Guile. So our Church (old
 Transl.) on Gen. ix. 27. which, according to
 the *Hebrew* runs, " God will be *Japhet* to
 " *Japhet*; and he shall dwell in the Tents of
 " *Shem*" Note, *He declareth, that the Gen-*
tiles which came of Japhet, and were separated
from the Church, should be joined to the same,
by the Persuasion of God's Spirit; and preach-
ing of the Gospel. And they render it, " God
 " *persuade Japhet, that he may dwell in the*
 " *Tents of Shem.*" And *persuade*, *entice*,
draw

draw away, is the Sense of פתח. *Enlarge*, in our present Translation, has no Foundation in the *Hebrew*. פתח *to open*, is another Root; and *to open*, a quite different Idea from *drawing aside* or *enticing along*. A Hinge does this to a Door, but the Hinge cannot be said to *open* the Door; the Door turns upon the Hinge when it opens; but *opening* as a Door does, and *drawing aside* as a Hinge does, are quite different Actions, and have not near so much Affinity in *Sense*, as the *Hebrew* Words have Similarity in *Letters*; though an ה and a פ are as much different Letters as any other two. Whether *Ham* חם was black or blackish himself, or it was his Posterity, yet the Name, one cannot help thinking, alluded to that surprizing Distinction betwixt most of his Posterity, and that of the other two Brothers. And here let me observe, that most of the Names of the Heads of the several Families, and of the Subdivisions of those Families, were given to the Persons who bore them, before the *Dispersion*, and that by those who were Prophets, or under the Guidance and Direction of those who were; and that the Countries they were sent into by Providence, being named from the Possessors, those Names, in *Canaan*, *e. gr.* are not to be deemed as given by *Heathens*, but many of them by the Spirit of God, whose Eye foreseeing all Events, suited *Names*, to answer the great Revolutions which

which they and their Countries should in Time, undergo. Can one help looking on מצרים *the Afflictors, or the Afflicted*, as predictive of what *Aegypt* was to be and suffer. The Affliction the People of God suffered from them, and the low Estate they have so long been in, and will, as long as the World stands be in, now, without a King or Prince of their own, a Province of Slaves to others, answers to the Name of this People, and seems designed in the Book of Providence to do so. *Canaan*, from נָכַן to *lay down* or *expose* upon the Ground, as a Merchant does his Goods for Sale; so to humble or cast down the Heart or Pride; and this Name so exactly answered the future Character of that People, that some, who did not observe how expressive the Word is of *trading* or *trafficking*, have thought, that *Merchant* was named from this People, and not they, from being Merchants. Whether *Chush*, כּוּשׁ, were named so with respect to his Colour, or the Colour of his Descendants, which is in the Fat under the Skin. The Negroes are, when first born, white, but in a few Hours that Pulp or Fat changes to a tawney, then a quite black. The Word is construed, *covered with Fatness*, Deut. xxxii. 15. and right enough by the Context; and it is in the Colour of their Fat that their Blackness consists, and not in the Skin; whether, I say, this was the Reason of his Name or no, it is a very proper one;

one; but was hardly accidental. There are about fourscore Names of Persons and Places, so named before the *Confusion*, Gen. x. all of which have the *Hebrew* Cast, and most of them common Names, or Words in common Use with the *Hebrews*, without the least Appearance of the *Syrian* Dialect among them; and let any one take an equal Number of Names together in *Joshua*, or from any of the genealogical Tables in *Genesis* or *Chronicles*, and compare them together, and he will find it as much Trouble to prove them, as to prove these, pure *Hebrew*; and when he has done that, let him compare these with the Names of Persons and Places in *Daniel*, *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah*, that are *Syriac*; and if the different Cast of the Words do not convince him, that there was no Mixture of that Dialect in the *Ante-Diluvian* and *Ante-Babel* Names, nothing can. But etymological Argument is further strengthened by Gen. ii. 23. where *Moses* tells us, the Woman was named חַוְוָה because taken out of אָדָם. Whatever Language you would fetch the Etymology from, it must be such an one as has a Word of the same Sense and Sound. The *Syriac* cannot do here in either Respect. *Gabarab*, (suppose common Sense would permit it to be used as the Name of a Woman); because taken from *Gabor*, a Man, or, in *Latin*, *Vir*, because taken from *Vir*, (were there such a Word

Word as *Vira*) yet אשׁוּב sounds neither *Gabrab* nor *Vira*. So again, *Adam*, because taken out of *Adame*, carrys a peculiar Sound as well as *Sense* with it. The *Universal History* seems to mistake the Argument here; it is not the meer *Paranomasia*, but the Sound and *Sense* together. *Moses* professeth to give us both the Name, and Interpretation of the Name, in these and many other Instances. *Homo*, from *Humus*, the Ground, answers tolerably well in one Respect, but not in the other. God called the Expansion שמים not שמיא, nor *Cælum*, nor *Heaven*. None of which answer in Sound, whatever the first may do in *Sense*, the Name God gave the Expansion. God called the Night, לילה; the Day, יום; he called the dry Land, ארץ*. Many Languages have a Word that sounds something like this last. Our Word *Earth* comes as near ארץ, as any perhaps. I imagine, *Moses* was bound in Veracity to give us those numerical Sounds or Words God fixed to the several Things, as much as he was to

Z

give

* The Lexicons derive this Name from רץ to run, because it moves round the Sun, but so do many other Orbs; and the Name is given to the dry Land, in Contradistinction to the Sea, though *per Synec.* it includes the whole. I should rather think, the Word descriptive of that Quality of the Earth, which its Usefulness depends upon, and that is to crumble, melt, and as we call it, to run; which when Ground does, it is fit for planting. All Vegetation depends upon the Ground's breaking or running. To run and please, as well as to break in Pieces and run, are in our Language, as well as the Hebrew, the same Thing in different Subjects.

give us the very Names of *Persons*, or their Titles, as that of *Joseph*. These Words and many others belong to no other Language in *Sound* or *Sense* than the biblical *Hebrew*; and yet these were the *numerical Names* imposed by God himself, and given by *Moses* in *Hebrew* Characters, revealed by God to him, for that Purpose; and they are not *Syriac* in their Grammar or Use. Night in *Syriac*, is, לילא; ארץ is ארע; and so others differ in some Respect or other from the *Hebrew* Words, or are not in Use in the *Syriac*. God taught *Adam* to speak, and instructed him in giving proper Names, *expressive*, I mean, of the Nature of the Things he gave the Names to; and it must be those numerical Sounds that *Moses* afterwards put into Characters, in all the Names that God is said to have given, *i. e.* to have taught *Adam* to give. These, as well as the Names of his Children, *Cain*, *Abel*, and so forth, are all pure *Hebrew*, and shew such a Similarity betwixt the *first Language* and *Hebrew*, as amounts to an *Identity*. And if it should be said, that the *Syriac* has many, and might have more, of the *Hebrew* Roots than are preserved in the Bible, and might coincide with the *Hebrew* in its grammatical Terminations, yet שמא and לילה *e. gr.* were prior to שמיא and ליליא and these latter the Corruption, or deviation, and consequently the *Hebrew* Form was the Original; and the nearer you bring the *Syriac* to the *Hebrew*, or *vice versa*, the stronger

stronger is the Argument against their *original* Difference; the one being so apparently a Corruption of the other.

Supposing any one Language first to have been general, as one Language must, when they were all one Family under one common Parent then living, and that, that Language did, as all fluctuating Things do, change in a proper Course of Time, the Difference would at first be such as between the *Hebrew* and *Syriac*, chiefly in the Terminations of their Words and grammatical Distinctions, and *mispellings*; and if Languages increased naturally, and not *miraculously*, they must retain some original Words in some Form or other; and they which were first formed, would have most of the Family Likeness and Features in them.

The Fragments of *Hebrew* in all Languages are a Proof against the *Confusion*; for were the *Hebrew* one of the little Ships that sprung out of the Ribs of the first great Ship at its Wreck, it could not be general enough to lend to all others; or were it the Language that was *confounded* into *Babble* and *Gibberish* in the Mouths of all but of *Canaan*, his eleven Sons, and the Line of *Arphaxad*, the rest, could not have retained any Part of it *unconfounded* in its proper Sense and Sound: For what is *confounding* it so that one should not understand another, but making them lose the Memory of the Words, and of the Mean-

ing of them when spoke by others? And did not the *Confusion* threaten the whole Tongue as well as Part of it? So that the *Hebrew* Words in all Languages, in our own in particular, which never were at *Babel*, are a Proof against the *Confusion*, and of the Priority of the *Hebrew*. As the Names before the Flood, and between the Flood and the Affair of *Babel*, are many of them, I may say, most of them, pure *Hebrew*, and all of them may be so, for what appears from the Manner of their Composition or Termination, so some of them, nay, most of them, are not of the *Syriac* Cast, or of any other Language that we know any Thing of, are not writ, and they must be writ, as they were pronounced, according to the *Syriac* Grammar. These are so many, as not justly to be called *a few*; they are two hundred and upwards; however they are all that are recorded; and it is strange, that all that are recorded of the primæval Tongue should be Parts of the *Hebrew*, and so exactly like it in Structure, that one may be as sure the Remainder was *Hebrew*, as that if one were to find a human Head, you would swear the Remainder of the Body was human.

When a Language is to be proved different from the *Hebrew*, a *single Word* is sufficient; and two or three, that are not explained, is ample Evidence. *Jager Sheduta*, is all the Evidence for the *Syriac*; and the few supposed

posed *Aegyptian* Titles above, for the *Aegyptian*. But the Names of all the Patriarchs before the Flood, and of all the chief Families, among whom the Earth was divided, before *the Confusion*, and the Names recorded to have been given by God himself to different Parts of the Creation, being all of *Hebrew* Form, and most of them in common Use in that Tongue, and some of which are explained in the *Hebrew* Sense of the Words, "are too few to build a general Observation upon;" and such Partiality is too glaring not to be seen.

The Inference that the Words, if any such there be, in *Syriac* and other *Dialects*, by which some of the (above) Words are better accounted for than by the *Hebrew*, are also Part of the Ante-Diluvian Language, is readily agreed to; and when it is proved, that any are better accounted for from *Syriac*, or other *Dialects*, or that some of them are to be accounted for at all, by other *Dialects*, then this Inference against the Antiquity of the *Hebrew*, will carry a little more Weight with it than it does at present. If the above Etymologies, or any of them, can be shewn to answer, both in Sense and Sound, when deduced from the *Syriac*, or any other *Dialect*, we must allow, that such Words must then be in *Being*, and the Dispute about the *Primævity* must call in other Aids, than barely these Words; but they will still prove, that
the

the Language that was then in Being, formed its Words as the *Hebrew* does.

The Study of the *Hebrew* has not long been revived; and when Men of great Parts and Abilities shall have got free of the Shackles, in reality, of *Pointing* and *Cabalism*, which have thrown a false Face over the *Hebrew*, and these Things are canvassed with less inward Heat and Prejudice, than *Novelties* from Inferiors are usually received with, by those who are, or think themselves, great; and Matters are canvassed fairly and impartially, the Mountains will dwindle into their original Mole-Hills, and the Niceties of the *Hebrew* Tongue appear in another Light. But while Friends and Enemies join, as *Job's* did by him, in watching his Steps, and setting a Trap for his Feet, little Mistakes shall be magnified into real Objections; and, as seen through the Mist of Prejudice, appear of a gigantic Size; while great Truths are slurred over, and passed by, or misrepresented. I have pitched upon one monumental Name always produced, not only as being *better* to be accounted for, but as absolutely necessary to be explained, by the *Syriac*, against the *Hebrew*; and flatter myself, its Etymology speaks as good *Hebrew*, as the other two monumental Names recorded with it; and that *Laban*, though *Syrian* by Birth, was yet *Hebrew* in his Faith and Language. But when we say, that *Abraham* and *Laban* were *Syrians*

rians by Birth, we must remember, that they were not so by Blood; and if *Arphaxad* had a different Language (which the old Hypothesis supposes) from the rest of his Brethren, his and *Aram's* Language must also be different, (as one would think, that of *Asber's* should also have been, and much more that of *Nimrod's*) and the *Syriac* should not be called *Abraham's* native Language. What we call *Syriac*, was the Language of the *Syrian*, *Assyrian* and *Babylonish* Kingdoms; but *Abraham's* native Tongue must be his Family Tongue, which *Shem*, *Arphaxad* and that Family, might retain to themselves, during their own Lives, notwithstanding their being Sojourners in the Territory of *Aram*, as their Descendants did for several Generations in *Ægypt*.

F I N I S.

view of this, we must remember that they
were not to be blood, and it was not to be
a human language (which the old
languages were) from the fact of the
his and Adam's language, and also the
tense (as one would think, that of
should also have been, and much more that
of the past, and the future should not be
called, as the new language. What
we call tense, was the language of the
old, African and Egyptian languages.
but Adam's native tongue must be his
Family Tongue, which Adam, I should
and that Family might retain to the
during their own lives, notwithstanding their
being separated in the Territory of Africa at
that time, and the several languages

in Africa.

31 W 13